

A REIOYNDER
vnto the
MILD DEFENCE,
IVSTIFYING THE
CONSIDERATION OF
the silenced Ministers Supplication
vnto the high Court of
Parliament.

WHEREIN IS PLAINELY DIS-
couered the Vanitie of the Ministers Ar-
guments for their Restitution; and they
irrefutably euinced to be properly SCHIS-
MATIQUES, *Vnworthie to be restored*
again to the vse and libertie of
their Ministerie;

By
GABRIEL POWEL.

G. P.

Let there be no strife, I pray thee, betweene thee and me, for we
are Brethren, *Genes. 13. 8.*

The Milde Defender.

The words of his mouth were softer then butter, yet warre is in his hart;
his words more gentle then oyle, yet were they swords, Plal. 55. 21.

G. P.

Iudge not, and you shall not be iudged, (*Luk. 6. 37.*) Though they
shew me all extremitie, yet will I not cease to loue them; and to
seeke their good, *August.*

AT LONDON,
Imprinted by Felix Kyngston, for Edward WWhitz.

T



no
le
for
A
to
to
w
T
an
fo
to
to
fo
w



TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE
the Lords Spirituall and Temporall,
the Knights, Citizens and Bur-
geses of the high Court of
Parliament.

IT is a remarkable speech, Right Honorable, that was often vsed by a reuerend and iudicious Prelate of our Church, *Doctor Aylmer* of happie memorie, sometimes Lord Bishop of London, whom for honor sake I nominate, a man both for wisdome and learning not inferiour ~~unto~~ any in his time; that *two sorts of men troubled: he peace of our Church, Papists and Apists*: both which, as much as in them lieth, labour to disioynt the frame of Ecclesiasticall Policie, and to ouerthrow the whole building, that so happilie was setled by our Fathers, and bequeathed vnto vs. The one sort assault our bulwarkes on the left hand; and the other on the right. The one, hating to be reformed, endeouour by all vile and exorbitant meanes to reenter, from whence they haue bin disseised, and to retaine still their Idolatrie; the other, imitating forreine Noueltie, vpon extremity of hatred towards the Church of Rome, doe striue to be vnlike

like the Papacie as is possible, disdaining euen the Apostolicall practise and discipline of the Primitiue Church, lest they should seeme in any thing to be imitators of them, whom they so much abhorred. The one losing their game by short-shooting, and the other by ouer-shooting. Finally, the one being the very plague and banie, and the other the disgrace and shame of Reformation.

Incredible haue bin the practises of both sorts, for the aduantaging and aduancing either of them their owne part. The former, like a cruell Tygre, or sauage Beare, haue not ceased from continuall plotting of bloodie designements, to accomplish their mischieuous intendment: and the later, like a wily Foxe, creeping into the bosome of their fauourers, vnder pretence of farther reformation, haue laboured to raise iealousie and suspition against the Kings sacred Maiestie, and the reuerend Gouvernours of our Church, wherby, setting all States by the eares, they might the more easily bring in their deformed Discipline, and anarchicall ataxie. But the more the waues and billowes beate against the rock, the more are they broken, and turne into a vaine foame or froath, and yet the rocke neuer the weaker: so the more the malice of our Aduersaries, on both sides, rageth against vs, our rocke is impregnable, hurt themselves they may, but cannot harme vs.

To speake no more in this place of the former sort, against the trayterous and rebellious furie of whom; your Honors haue giuen the Church of God good hope of rest, by the iust lawes that were enacted against them, at your last Session of Parliament,

ment, to the perpetuall eternizing of your worthe names among al posteritie. I am now enforced once againe, euen before the barre of your most iudicious Court, to maintaine the iust and holy quarrel of our Mother-Church, against the restlesse malice, and importunate caulls of her owne superstitious and turbulent Children, our factious Brethren.

It may please your graue Wisedomes therefore to call to mind, that at the last Session, there was a *Supplicatorie Pamphlet* directed vnto your HH. by the *Apists*, (that I may so tearme them with that worthy Bishop) of the concision, to prouoke you, either to become Suiters and Suppliants vnto his excellent Maiestie in behalfe of their Cause, or else to determine of it your selues : wherein also the Auctor (presuming belike he could neuer be discovered, being a Cimmerian brood) both vndutifully, and vnto the Christian Magistrates, and the reuerend Prelats of our Church, of rigorous and cruel dealing, and so mainely cried out, as if the Gospell of Christ Iesus were banished out of this kingdome, Gods worship prophanely adulterated, and our whole Ministerie strangely corrupted, to the eternal destruction of many thousand soules. Against which libell containing so manifest sycophancie and palpable vntruths, I haue opposed an equall (I hope) and iust *Consideration*, dedicated in like manner euen vnto your most wise and graue Assemblie. But behold, as there is nothing so sincerely spoken, but some cauilling witte or other, will be ready to carpe at : so hath there stept vp another bird of the same Cimmerian nest (as he would seeme to be) an abet-

tor and auoucher of that most slanderous libel, who hath vndertaken the *Defence* thereof against the *Consideration*; hauing indeed worse provided for the credit of their cause, then his Auctor had done before him, by how much he is the more intemperate and immodest, not sparing any man whom he conceiueth not to be of his owne priuate straine and spirit, throughout the whole course of his *Defence*, producing euery man at his pleasure, vpon the theatre of enuious diffamation, notwithstanding he would seeme to appeare vnder the cloake and title of a *Milde and iust Defender*; yet he neuer ceaseth, traducing the right hand of holy Iustice, armed of God with a punishing power against all euill doers, and namely against schismaticall procurers, and factious frequenters of priuate conuenticles and vnlawfull assemblies: and complaining of great extremities with tragicall speeches, as if the like rigour had neuer been heard of in the world that they suffer, only (as he saith) for their conscience sake forsooth, which cannot conforme it selfe vnto the auncient Discipline, and approved Ceremonies of our Church: yea, and malepertly slandering the Christian Assemblie of Parliament, to be a partie with them, to fauour their factious schisme, and to haue intermedled and dealt for them alreadie, thereby laying himselfe open to the iust reproofe and condemnation of all Readers. For what English man will not now condemne both these Sycophants, for false witnesses against the Church of God, the Christian Magistrates, and all the noble States of this kingdom, when they shal reade or heare them in so many

Both in the
Epistle Dedicatorie of the
Milde Defence
and also pag
30. 40. 8. &c.

ny things, to be so fouly diffamed, contrarie to the knowledge of all the land.

Against this intamous rhapsodie therfore, I haue once againe presumed by your Honourable leaue and fauour to stand in the gap, and penned this insuing *Reioynder*, not in mine owne defence, for I freely forgiue them, and winke at all such indignities and disgraces as are offered me in particular; but lest I should seeme to forsake so holie and iust a quarrell, in maintaining, to my weake abilitie, the Glorie of G O D, in the necessarie defence of his Church and the honour of our reuerend Bishops in their most lawfull, equall and moderate proceedings, against the schismaticall disturbers both of Church and Common wealth. All which I willingly submit vnto the iudicious censure, as of all indifferent Readers in generall, so of your H H. in particular, who, I hope, will be satisfied better with that which may bee rather sure for defence, than faire for shew; both for the graue Wisedome G O D hath endued you with, and for the accustomed fauour you are wont to shew, to all such as to their power doe endeavour faithfully to serue the Lord.

And now because it lieth in your power, to stay the e false and slanderous exclamations, and to put a finall end to all quarrels amongst Brethren, by enacting some iust and straight L A W, for punishing the wilfull and obstinate Superstition of the *factious Schismatique*, as your Honours haue already worthily done against the *idolatrours Recusant*: may it please your Wisedomes to consider that the benefit thereof, through the blessing of God, must

needes be inestimable, both to the present state of the Church, in composing our home-Controuersies, and recouering those our poore Brethren, who now (alas!) are estranged and alienated from vs, that there may bee but one flocke and one folde, as there is but one Shepheard Christ Iesus: and also to all posteritie, who hauing the holy Doctrine and Sacraments of Christ vniformely taught, and deliuered according to the truth of the Gospell, as an inestimable treasure, left and committed vnto their trust, to be deliuered ouer from age to age to the end of the world, should haue infinite cause to glorifie and praise God, for so vnspeakeable a benefit, and reuerently to keepe with all honour the famous names of their so Christian and noble progenitors and predeceffors in euerlasting memorie.

Which so honourable an Act, for the seruice of God and infinite commoditie of the Church, though I bee not worthie vpon my knees to make any such motion vnto your Wisedomes yet apprehending the benefit thereof to be such as I haue declared, with your gracious fauours, as kneeling before the barre of your most noble Court, in all humilitie and reuerence, I most humbly beseech your Honours for the zeale you beare to God and to his onely Sonne Christ Iesus; for the loue you haue to the faith and doctrine of the Gospell; for the pitie you must needs haue to behold the contentions and ruptures of our Church; and finally for the happie example and direction, not only of your own noble children, and childrens children, but of all the posteritie of Christendome, to whom the knowledge
hercof

hereof may happily come; that it would please your Wisedomes to be the Honourable meanes vnder his excellent Maiestie, who (I know) cannot but Royally assent to what you shall decree herein, to vndertake so Christian and famous an enterprise, and to see so worthy an Act performed, to the great Glorie of almightie God, and the perpetuall settlement and quietnes of our most flourishing Church and kingdome. Which worke of immortall fame to all posteritie, if your Honours shall effect, the Church of God shall pray for you and blesse you, and the Lord IESVS shall abundantly reward you for it. Thus, leauing this most humble Suite, not of one, though offered by my vnworthie hand, nor of a few, but of the whole CHURCH of Christ vnto your Honors godly Wisedomes, and the same vnto the happie direction of Gods holy

Spirit; I come now to ioyn
with my Antagonist.

inf
lin

T
plia



A REIOYNDER
VNTO THE MILD DEFENCE,
Justifying the Consideration of the silen-
ced Ministers Supplication to the
Parliament.



He maine Proposition of this *De-* The Defen-
fence, tendeth to the vindicating ders Propo-
and clearing of the Arguments of tion.
the silenced Ministers, in their
Supplication vnto the high Court
of Parliament, against the iust ex-
ceptions taken against them in the
Consideration thereof. But how wel
the Defender quitteth himself, and
iustifieth his Cause against all exceptions, shall (God wil-
ling) be manifest in the sequels.

The Title of the Supplication.

Certaine Arguments to prouoke the *Supplica-*
present high Court of Parliament to *tion.*
zeale, for the Ministers now silenced.

ANSVVERE.

The exception here generally taken in the *Cōsideration*,
was that all these XIX. Reasons vrged by the Sup-
pliants, were

Common Arguments (excepting one or two) Answered
and

That the Sup-
plicants Argu-
ments are
Common Ar-
guments.

and might be vrged for Poperie, or for any other Heresie whatsoeuer, which the learned know to be an intolerable fault in a Scholler, and were a sufficient answer vnto them all, &c.

Replie.

The Defender replieth, that they are not Common Arguments: *Are Popish, or other hereticall Priests* (saith he) *Ministers of Christ, in grace and fauour with him? Do the Angels so long after and reioyce in their Ministerie, as in ours? Do they as truly interpret the mysteries of God to eternall life, as Ioseph interpreted dreames for this life? The like may be said of the other Arguments.*

Reioynder.

But the quession is not, what either these, or they of the Defenders faction, are indeed: but what euery one of them esteemeth and taketh himselfe to be. There is not one of these named by the Defender, but will affirme, that he is the *Minister of Christ, in grace and fauour with him*, that the *Angels long after, and reioyce in their Ministerie*, that they *truly interpret the mysteries of God to eternall life*, and so of the rest, as boldly and as confidently, as any of the Refractorie Ministers will. Wherefore, if all these will insill in, and produce the very same Arguments, for confirmation of their heresie, and to procure grace and fauour vnto their partie, as well as the Supplicants do: how is it, that they may not be termed, *Common Arguments*?

The Defenders fallacie in his impertinent instances, is manifest in this word; for he changeth the state of the Question. Wherefore the Defenders Epiphoneme, which heere he hath vauntingly and triumphantly inserted, may be returned into his owne botome: *This beginning sheweth, What we are to looke for in the rest of the Defence.*

I. ARGUMENT.

Supplicat.

The Ministers supplicated for, are the Ministers of Christ, sent by God, and
in

Arg. 1. THE MILD DEFENCE. 107

in grace and fauour with God. Not to speake for them, is to spare speech for God himselfe, for Christ Iesus, and for the euerlasting saluation of many thousand Soules.

Ergo, The honorable and high Court of Parliament ought to intercede with his Maiestie for them.

ANSWER.

I. To the Antecedent.

I

WE willingly grant that the Refractory Ministers are indeed *the Ministers of Christ* in the ministrati^on of his Gospell, neither is their calling brought in question: and we hope also, that they are sent by GOD, and in grace and fauour with GOD. Yet must they remember, that their Sanctification being in part, they haue but their measure of gifts and graces: for *our knowledge is but in part*, as the Apostle testifieth; and therefore that they may be ignorant and ouerseene in some things, wherein they ought not to flatter themselues, but by all meanes labour to come to vnderstanding, that they may attaine vnto the knowledge of the truth.

The Defender replieth. *Heere is a manifest contrarietie. Replie.* He that is refractarie, cannot be such a Minister of Christ. He that is in grace and fauour with God, ought not to be disgraced and molested by men.

But I wonder the Defender is so Eagle-sighted, that he can spie a contrarietie, where there is none at all. *He that is Refractarie be good Men.*

Answered.

Reioynder.

In what sense the refractarie Ministers may

Refractarie, cannot be such a Minister of Christ. Well. Neither do I say that he is such, as he is Refractarie, but in the *ministration of the Gospell*, which words the Defender hath purposedly, if not maliciously, omitted in my answer, lest his cunning might have bin espied at the first blush. *Aaron* was the Priest of almighty God, in grace and fauour with him; but not in that he made the golden Calfe, (*Exod. 32.4.*) *Peter* was the Apottle of Iesus Christ, in grace and fauour with him; but not as he went not the right way to the truth of the Gospell, (*Galat. 2.14.*) So the refractarie Ministers may be the Ministers of Iesus Christ, and in grace and fauour with him, but not as they erre, or are schismaticall or Refractarie. Where is the contrarietie? *Ad populum phalaras*: the Defender disputeth not *ad idem*. His error is two-fold,
 1. Ε'λπιζοντες παρὰ τὸ θεοῦ τὴν ἀπολύτωσησιν. 2. Ε'λπιζοντες παρὰ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τὴν ἰλίσσιν.

But, *he that is in grace and fauour with God, ought not to be disgraced and molested by men.* True, they ought not to be molested, in or for that thing which procures them grace and fauour with God: which must be so restrained. Otherwise the Defender must needs plead for immunitie and freedome for any transgressor and disturber of ciuill society, to do what he listeth, vncontrouled by the Magistrate; or deny that any such is in grace and fauour with God, which I thinke he will not doe. The Errour, is the same with the former.

II.

Answer.

It is true also, that *not to speake and take paines for the Ministers of the Gospell*, for such things as properly belong vnto their Ministerie, or are requisite vnto the performance thereof, is to *spare speech for GOD, and for Iesus Christ*, according vnto the places quoted in the Argument, and also *to hinder the saluation of Gods people.*

Reply and
Reioynder.

Here the Defender, as if he had lost himselfe in some inextricable labyrinth, idly discourseth of the tearmes, *proper* and

Arg. 1. THE MILD DEFENCE. 109

and *necessarie*, and saith that I confound both, which any man, though but of meane capacitie, may easily see I doe not: adding moreover, that *the Libertie of preaching doth not properly belong to the ministerie of the Gospell*; as if it were lawfull for Coblers and Tinkers to preach the Gospell, which is absurd and scandalous. The error, is *Πασις Ἀδελφῶν* *ἀφ' ὧν, and ἁπλοῦς, ὅτι καὶ ἐν Θεολογία.* Note, the Defenders absurd Position.

II. To the Consequence.

If the Suppliant had prayed your high Court of Answer. Parliament to intreate in their behalte, for matters which had necessarily concerned *the Gospell of Christ*, or their *Ministerie thereof*, or *the Saluation of many thousand Soules*, then had your Honorable Assemblie some reason to mediate for them: But seeing it is but only to free them from the *Crosse* and *Surplice*, and such other laudable *Ceremonies* of the Church, commanded for order and decencie sake, which may well stand with the puritie of the Gospell, seeing *The kingdome of heauen stands not in meate and drinke, &c.* Then haue these importunate Suppliants greater reason to beare that burden in the diligent applying their vocation and calling, then to trouble your Wisdomes with such petie and small matters.

The Defender, omitting the weight of Reason in this Reply. answer to the Consequence, snarleth onely at certaine words and phrases; replying, *1. If Crosse and Surplice bee lawdable Ceremonies, then when or where the Sacraments are celebrated without them, there wanteth some lawdable ceremonies. This is absurd and impious. What would further follow hereof, I needs not to write.*

This is neither absurd, nor impious, neither can the Defender shew the least inconuenience that followeth hereof: for there is no doubt, but the Sacraments may bee administred without either these, or diuers other lawdable ceremonies,

110 A REIDYNDER TO *Arg. 1.*

ceremonies, and yet no sinne committed, neither in the omission, nor in the vse of them, if the particular circumstances and occasions so require.

Of the Ceremonies of the Lords Supper.

And that the Defender may see, that this is so, as I asseirme, I will insist onely, for example sake, in the ceremonies of the Lords Supper. And because haply he doth not know (so grosse his ignorance seemes to bee throughout this whole Defence) what the learned meane by *Ceremonies of the Lords Supper*, it may please him to vnderstand, that thereby they meane all the whole externall action of that Sacrament, namely whatsoever is the object, either of the eies, of the eares, or of the hands, whether it be an element, or gesture, or words spoken by the Minister.

Ceremonies of the Lords Supper twofold.

1. *Essentiall*,

These *Ceremonies* therefore are of two sorts: Some be *Essentiall*; and some *Accidental*. The *Essentiall Ceremonies* are these; that Christ had, 1. his Disciples gathered together, 2. a fit table, 3. true bread, 4. naturall wine, 5. that he gaue thanks, 6. brake the bread, 7. distributed it, 8. declared the vse thereof, 9. that his Disciples tooke, ate, and drunke, 10. and so declared the Lords death. These *Ceremonies* are so proper and necessarie vnto the Lords Supper, that without them, a man could not communicate rightly according vnto the institution, commandement and example of Christ.

2. *Accidental*,

NW.

The *Accidental Ceremonies*, are that Christ celebrated his Supper, 1. in the euening, 2. in a chamber prepared, 3. after meate, 4. together with his twelue Disciples, 5. sitting at the table, 6. with vnleauened bread, 7. so apparelled, &c. These *Ceremonies* doe not properly and necessarily belong vnto the action of the Supper, because they do not signifie any mysterie, neither did Christ say, *Do this*, after meate, or with such a number of communicants, or sitting, or so apparelled, &c. Wherefore herein every man ought to follow the determination and practise of that Church wherein he liueth: otherwise none but Ministers ought to participate this Sacrament; and where should we finde the same chamber prepared? the same table? the same cloath? the

Arg. 2. THE MILD DEFENCE. III

the same dishes, &c. And who should be Christ? who *Indas* the traytor? who *Iohn* that leaned on Christs breast? such as were in that Supper. To imitate these things, were apish, childish and foolish. The Defenders error, is *Trachysia in Theologia*.

2 Because I had said, out of the Apostle, *The kingdome of beauen stands not in meate and drinke*, the Defender replies, *The kingdome of beauen consisteth as well in the Abuse of outward things as of other matters.*

Good Lord! What is become of the Defenders reason Reioynder. and sense? Did euer any man heare the like horrible speech vttered by a man of common sense, much lesse by a Diuine; *The kingdome of beauen consisteth IN THE Abuse of outward things!* I professe ingenuously, I cannot imagine what he would say, he speaketh so absurdly and grossly, yea so blasphemously: for I am sure, this proposition is truer in Diuinitie, *The kingdome of HELL consisteth in the abuse of outward things.* O me, that it was my hard hap, to haue such an ignorant senselesse man, to become my antagonist! What? had not the refractarie Ministers one Scholler amongst them, to defend their cause? Why then haue they made choice of this man to doe it, who in true Theologie knowes not his right hand from his left? The Errour is a monstrous and blasphemous *Trachysia in Theologia*.

Another Position of the Defenders.

II. ARGVMENT

The Ministerie of the Gospel is not only *Supplicat.* for earthly men, but also for heauenly Angels. To speake for the Ministerie and Ministers thereof, is to speake not only for God, but also for the Angels.

Ergo, The high Court of Parliament is bound

A REIOYNDER TO *Arg. 2.*
bound to plead for the Ministers : o-
therwise by Sparing Speech, they shal
prouoke both the Lord himselve, and
also the whole host and armie of
heauen against them.

ANSVVERE.

THE Defender, disdainig to follow the resolution
which I had made of this Argument, and vnderstan-
ding not his Auctor, thus inspidely and vnwisly gathereth
the Reason. *By the Ministerie of the Gospell, the Angels of
heauen receaue diuine reuelation to their farther ioy. Ergo. To
speake for the Ministerie and Ministers of the Gospell, is to
speake for Angels.* To say nothing how he gathereth this
Antecedent from the Suppliants Reason; what is this Con-
clusion to the Court of Parliament? how doth it inforce
them, to speake for the schismaticall Ministers? or are the
Angels so distressed, that they need intercessors? But I an-
swere, as in the Consideration.

I. To the Antecedent.

I.

Answer.

That the *Ministers of the Gospell is for Angels*, is an
ambiguous and perplexed speech, and saours of a
Paradoxe. For how will the Suppliants vnderstand
this saying: Is the Ministerie of the Gospell, so or-
dained for Angels, that they should bee Ministers
thereof? Vnpssible. Is the Ministerie ordained to
conuert them, and to preach repentance vnto them?
Absurd. Seeing they neuer sinned. Or is it because
thereby they might learne and know the Wisdome
of God? But so doe they also by all other the crea-
tures and actions of God.

The

Arg. 2. THE MILD DEFENCE. 113

The Defender replieth: *No paradox at all. Neither had Reply the Answerer any cause, to make the first two questions. That which he opposeth to the third, against the knowledge of the Wisdom of God by the Gospell, may as well be opposed to mens knowledge of the Wisdom of God by his Word: for they are also taught the Wisdom of God by his creatures and works.*

But I neuer denied, that the Angels vnderstood the Wisdom of God by the preaching of the Gospell, as appeareth manifestly by my words; wherefore vaine and idle is this needlesse defence. Yet the Defender at last, leauing his Auctor lying flat vpon his backe in the plaine field, to shift for himselfe, saith, *The further meaning of this argument, in any speciall manner differing from other, I leane to the Auctor himselfe: who is able, no doubt, to defend his meaning, or to yeeld better reason to the contrarie. To the contrarie of what? to the contrarie, that the Auctor cannot defend himselfe? I know not what the Defender should meane by these last words, to the contrarie: but whatsoever his meaning be, he confesseth plainly, that he is not able to defend the Auctor of the Supplication, and so leaueth him to our mercie.*

II.

What can this make for the Suppliants? The Answer. Controuersie betweene them and vs, is not concerning the *Ministerie of the Gospell*, but touching a few petie accidentall circumstances: for which, if any man forsake the necessarie function of his Ministerie and calling, he hath the more to answer for.

The Defender, faining that this second answer hath received sufficient satisfaction already; (but where?) addeth. *Whereas he chargeth vs, to forsake our Ministerie for a few petie accidentall circumstances, therein he discovereth the nakednes of the Prelates, in inflicting so materiall and substantiall punishment, for so few petie accidentall circumstances. For iustice requireth a proportion betwixt the offence and the punishment. But we acknowledge no offence.*

Very well. They acknowledge no offence. Therefore, they

Reioynder.
doe

doe not offend. A sound consequence, I warrant you. As touching the Prelats, I answer, that in inflicting the punishment he speaketh of, they doe but their dutie, by executing the lawes vpon offenders, in obedience towards the superiour Magistrate, for the peace and quietnes of the Church; and let all the World iudge, whether it be more meet & fit, that these self-conceited refractaries should dutifully conforme themselves, or that the Magistrate, to satisfie their wrangling and restless humour, should dissolue the whole frame of so well seiled gouernment.

III.

Answer.

Euery man is bound to promote the *Ministerie of the Gospel* to his power, and also to helpe and further a Minister thereof, as he is a Minister, not as he is in error, or caried away with faction.

Reply.

The Defenders replic is, *In his third answer, he proclaimeth againe, but prometh not our error and faction. If we erre, or be factious, let vs in that respect be punished (so notwithstanding that the people be not punished with vs) and let vs be helpen, as we are Ministers.*

Reioynder.

I haue proued so much as the Defender desires already at large, in my booke *De Adiaphoris*, neither was I in the Consideration to make any idle digressions, but to keepe my selfe strictly to the point and question in controuersie there handled. The refractarie Ministers are punished, only as they are in error, and factious, as euery man knoweth, and haue as much fauour as they can desire, as they be Ministers. And for the people, neither are they punished with them, nor for their sakes: but both are and shall be sufficiently provided for, without their helpe, seeing they doe so vndutifully forsake them.

II. To the Consequence.

I

Answer.

It doth not follow, that because the wise and iudicious assemblie of Parliament iustly refuse to intermeddle

Arg. 2. THE MILD DEFENCE. 115
intermedle in the quarell of Schismaticall Ministers,
farther then to admonish them to desist from their
singularity and turbulent dealing, that therfore they
shall prouoke the Lord of Hostes, and all the An-
gels and Saints in heauen against them. But rather
it followeth on the contrarie.

II.

If that Honorable Court should take part with
Schismatikes, and intercede for them, to detaine
both them and the people still in faction and error,
then certainly they should prouoke the wrath of
God, and the whole Host of heauen against them,
Psal. 50. 17. 18. &c.

What saith the Defender to this? *I reason from your owne Replie.
words against you. The wise and iudicious Parliament will not
intermedle in the quarrell of Schismaticall Ministers, fur-
ther than to admonish them to desist from their singularity.
But the Parliament hath further intermedled for vs. Ergo, We
are not Schismaticall.*

I answered. To let passe the forme of this Syllogisme; the Reioynder.
Assumption is a foule and slanderous imputation malepert-
ly and vniustly laid vpon the high Court of Parliament: The Defender
most impudently charging and challenging that honorable
Assemblee, not onely to fauour their seditious faction, but
also, as a partie in their schisme, to haue intermedled and
dealt in their behalfe, contrarie to the knowledge of the
whole kingdome. For what hath the Parliament done?
what haue they spoken for them? where is their decree and
statute? Are two or three, the whole Parliament? What re-
ward the Defender deserueth for this bold slander against
the Parliament house, I leaue to their wise consideration
and censure, whom it concerneth and more neerely tou-
cheth. His error is, *Crimen falsi.*

III. ARGVMENT.

It is a sinne not to recompense a good
turne receiued.

Ergo, The refractarie Ministers are to
be regarded and spoken for.

ANSVVERE.

I.

Answer.

IT is true : good deeds must be rewarded, special-
ly the Ministers faithfull labours. The Apostle
saith (1. Cor. 9. 11.) *If we haue sown vnto you spiritmall
things, is it a great thing &c.*

II.

But in that the refractarie Ministers haue *looked
backe*, and withdrawne their hands from the plough
(Luk. 9. 62.) making a manifest Schisme, and di-
sturbing the peace of the Church, this deserueth no
recompense.

Reply.

Whether the
refractarie
Ministers be
Schismaticques

Here the Defender bestirreth himselfe, and produceth all
his forces, to prooue that the refractarie Ministers are not
Schismaticques. *I say first of all* (saith he) *that this accusation
of vs to be Schismaticques, is a most beggerly begging of the
Question, most vniust, vnttrue and vncharitable, neuer yet pro-
ned, neither able to be proued; untill they proue the matters in
controuerfie, to be meereely indifferent to such vses, as whereto
they are imple:de and urged by them, yea good and laudable ce-
remonies, matters of decencie and order in the Church: yea that
wee also refuse to conformance our selues vnto them, more of sto-
macke, than of conscience.*

The Defen-
ders first Rea-
son, that the
Ministers are

Two things the Defender saith must be performed by
vs, before the refractarie Ministers will acknowledge them-
selues to be Schismaticques; 1. That we *prone the matters in
controuerfie*

Arg.3. THE MILD DEFENCE. 117

controversie to be indifferent. 2. That we enince them, to refuse not Schisma-
conformitie rather of stomacke, than of conscience. Touching tiques, ouer-
the first, we haue already in diuers Bookes and Treatises throwne.
purposely written to that end, more then sufficiently pro-
ued the things in controuersie, to be meerey indifferent,
both in their owne nature, and to such vses as the Church
allotteth and appointeth them. And for the Second, I know
not well what the Defender meaneth thereby. What? shall
a thiefe be a thiefe, notwithstanding that to steale be not a-
gainst his conscience? shal an heretique be an heretique, al-
beit he thinketh he holdeth nothing but truth? and must
not a Schismaticke be a Schismaticke, vnlesse he be conuin-
ced to sinne against his owne conscience? What Schisma-
tique will euer confesse, that he is such euen against his con-
science? By this meanes no man shall euer be conuinced to
be a Schismaticke. But we know, that obstinate contuma-
cie against the Church in things lawfull, is a schisme, what-
soeuer a mans conscience be. Consciences are of diuers and Consciences
fundrie sorts; there is one Conscience that is too large are of two
and prophane; and another Conscience too strict and supersti- sorts.
tious; a Popish Conscience; and a Precise Conscience, I 1. Too large.
meane in the extreame. So then the first part of this Argu- 2. Too strict.
ment being abundantly proued by vs; and the second be-
ing atheologicall and ridiculous, what remaineth but that
the Defender labour the refractarie Ministers, to acknow-
ledge their ouersight, and to yeeld to conformitie.

The Defenders second Reason, to proue that the refractarie Ministers are not Schismaticques, is this. *There is nothing beere objected against vs, wherewith our ancients and bea-
ters haue not been charged in former times. Eliah was charged
with troubling Israel. Michaiah might haue been charged with
singularitye and Schisme, for dissenting from the 400. Prophets.
Jeremie was accused by the Priests and Prophets, to haue spo-
ken against the State of the Citie. Amos was charged with con-
spiracie against the King. The enemies of Daniel framed the
like accusation against him to Darius. Our Saviour himselfe
was blasphemed by the name of a seducer and deceiuer. Paul*

Reply.

was accused, that he taught against the Law and the Temple. Such also have been the accusation of all Martyrs by the common Adversaries the Papists. And such are the Prelats accusations against us.

Reioynder.
The Defen-
ders 2 Reason
overthrowne.

I answer. As for *Michaiab*, because the false Prophets did not accuse him of singularitye and schisme, the Defender becomes their Advocate, and doth as much for them: by what right, let himselfe looke to it. But who will not detest the impudencie of the Defender, in that he dareth equall the refractarie Ministers case, with the condition of the Prophets and Apostles, of the blessed Martyrs, yea of CHRIST himselfe? But, not to particularize, I answer, in generall. The difference betweene the examples alleaged and their case, is very great, & easie to be discerned. 1. Those holy men did nothing contrarie to their vocation; these do. 2. They taught nothing but the truth of God, necessarie to be receiued; these teach their owne fancies. 3. They neuer oppugned the lawfull auctoritie of the Magistrate in Ecclesiasticall causes, and Things indifferent; these do. 4. They were vniustly accused by the false Church for doing their office and dutie; these are iustly taxed by the true Church (as themselves cannot deny) for hatefull schisme and faction. 5. The Error is, *Εἰς ἕνα πᾶσι τὸν ἑσπέρου ὁ ἕλεος*.

Reply.

His third Reason, is: *Do we varie from the sincere doctrine of the Scriptures?* Nay, rather many of them doe much more swarme from the same; touching generall grace, and the death of Christ for every particular person; against particular election and reprobation; for Images in Churches for deuotion; touching the manner of Christs presence in the Eucharist; that the Pope is not the Antichrist, whereby they hinder the zeale of Christian Princes from executing that against him in generall, and against his members in particular, which the Word partly foretelleth, and partly commandeth to be done; concerning the necessitie of Baptisme; touching auricular confession; for ignorance in the people. Who can lay any such points to vs, or to any of vs?

Reioynder. I answer, 1. The Defenders report of our doctrine, is verily

Arg. 3. THE MILD DEFENCE. 119

terly vntue: for we detest and abhorre euen all and every of the particular points, he saith we teach. Wherefore let him either iustifie these things to be true, out of the Confession of the faith of our Church (which he ought to do, if he challenge vs for Doctrine) or by any writer of ours of credit in the Church: or let him feare without repentance and satisfaction for it by confessing his ignorance, and malice in thus slandering the Church of God, the iust condemnation of Lyers and false witnesses, whose portion is with hypocrites. 2. His Argument is this, *The refractarie Ministers do not varie from the sincere doctrine of the Scriptures.* Ergo, *They are not Schismatiques.* To let the Antecedent passe; for I haue not obserued, that any of them erre in any fundamentall or materiall point of doctrine (which we thanke God for, praying farther for their preservation vnto the end, in the vnyty of faith with vs) albeit I know that many amongst them haue their particular fancies in some smaler points: I deny the Consequence; for a man may be a Schismaticque, and yet hold the entire and sound profession of the sauing truth of God, as shall be manifest presently. The Error is, *Ἐκ τῆς ἀρετῆς τοῦ λόγου καὶ τῆς ἐπιστάσεως.* The Defender seemes not to vnderstand what *Schisme* is. His returning of the Schisme vpon vs, is ridiculous, and not worthy the answering: for Schisme is a contumacie or separation of the parts from the whole, nor of the whole from the parts.

The Defender
slandereth
our Church
for false Do-
ctrine.

The Defen-
ders 3. Reason
ouerthrowne.

The fourth Reason is, *Haue wee made any departure from the Church? We are deprived of our Ministerie, and so thrust out of our liuings perforce against our willes, as any man leaueth that which is violently taken away: but though wee be thus put from our Ministerie and liuings by our Prelats, yet doe we not forsake the communion of the Church.*

Reply.

The argument is briefly thus: *The refractarie Ministers haue not forsaken the Communion of the Church of England.* Ergo, *They are not Schismatiques.* I answer, *Schismatiques* are of two sorts; 1. *Such as separate themselves from the Church;* and that either from the whole Catholique, or from any particular Church. 2. *Such as raise contentions*

Reioynder.
The Defen-
ders 4. Reason
ouerthrowne.
Schismatiques
of two sorts.

1. Separatists.
2. Faction
men.

and stirre vp factions in the Church, and are *contumacious and disobedient* towards their Gouvernours: Of which sort are the refractarie Ministers. Touching that the Defender saith, they leaue their charge, *as a man leaueeth that which is violently taken away* from him: that doth not extenuate their fault any whit, seeing they by their obstinate superstition, disable themselves from doing that good in their places, which they ought to doe; and so disturbe the peace of the Church, that for preservation of vnitie, the Magistrate is compelled to thrust them out of their places.

Reply.

The fifth Reason, is: *Haue wee loitered in the worke of the Ministry? haue we heaped benefice vpon benefice? haue we eaten and drunke, and beaten our fellow-seruants? haue we sought our owne, and not that which is Iesus Christs? haue wee made our bellies our God? haue we minded earthly things? Whereas the word Schisme in the Greeke language signifieth a renting; and the word Sedition in the Latine, signifieth seorsim ire, to goe aside, or a going aside; we haue proued that in these significations, we cannot be charged with Schisme.*

Reioynder.
The Defen-
ders 5. Reason
ouerthrowne.

I answer. This Reason is parallel vnto the next going before. I marueile the Defender braggeth of the refractaries diligence in their Ministerie, seeing they wilfully abandon their calling. If at any time they haue been diligent, I would God they had not looked backe, but continued their diligence still. As for pluralitie of benefices; what difference is there, between heaping one benefice vpon another, and one benefit vpon another? their gifts and beneuolences are not vnknowne. Is not reuiling and slandering their fellow-seruants, to beate them? Doe they not wilfully refuse their charge, because they may not be tolerated in their superstition and faction? Doe they not refraine to labour in Gods seruice, to serue their owne appetites and affections? and yet, loe, they minde no earthly things! And for the Defenders philosophie, touching *Schisme* and *Sedition*, it is no marueile (the rest of his booke being sutable vnto this) he is ignorant, that *Sedition* is that in the Common-wealth, which *Schisme* is in the Church; for he confounds both.

Ignorance of
the Defender.

The

Arg. 3. THE MILD DEFENCE. 121

The sixt and last Reason, is: *All Schismatiques are abomination to the Lord. The Ministers pleaded for are not abomination to the Lord, but in grace and fauour with him. Ergo, The Ministers pleaded for, are no Schismatiques. The Proposition is Salomons. The Assumption is the Answerers.*

Inswere, 1. The Proposition is true, with this restraint, Reioynder. to wit, as they be Schismatiques: otherwise (questionlesse) The Defenders 6. Reason
diuers elect and holy Children of God, by reason of the infirmities of their nature, may fall, as well into the sinne of Schisme, as vnto any other sinne, except that against the holy Ghost. 2. The Assumption may be vnderstood two waies; 1. *The Ministers are not abomination to the Lord*, to wit, as they be Ministers of the Gospell, or holy men, which is the sense that I granted it in; and so it is true: but then the middle tearme is not spoken *ad idem* with the Proposition, for there are foure tearmes (as the Schoole speaks) in the Syllogisme, contrarie to the law of true reasoning, and so concludeth nothing. 2. It may be vnderstood thus, *The Ministers are not abomination to the Lord*, to wit, as they be schismaticall and factious, which is the sense of the Proposition, neuer granted by me; and so the Assumption is vterly false: for the Ministers, as they are schismaticall, sinne; and so are an abomination to the Lord. The Error, is *Abol-*

negat.

Hauing refused the Defenders Reasons, whereby he laboured to cleere the refractarie Ministers from the iust imputation of *Schisme*, I thinke it not impertinent (seeing the Defender hath referred this point to bee here discussed) to speake something of *SCHISME*, and to make it plaine and euident vnto all men, that the refractarie Ministers are indeed and properly *SCHISMATIQVES*; which wee will (God willing) irrefutably euince out of the true definition and nature of *Schisme*: and the rather, to stop their mouthes, that hereafter, when wee shall tearme them (as they are indeed) *Schismatiques*, they may not except, that wee begge the Question.

That the refractarie Ministers are propellie Schismatiques

Of SCHISME.

S^{X I X M A} *Schisme*, is properly a renting, diuiding, or cutting in sunder of a solide bodie, such as is the cleauing of wood, which diuideth and separateth the vnited parts of the same.

This word is metaphorically retained in the Church, and vsed by Diuines, to signifie such as raise contentions and disquietnes in the Church, or separate themselves from the same, or institute or frequent priuate conuenticles and assemblies.

Schisme defined.

Schisme therefore is a wilfull breaking of the vniity of the Church, either by separation from the same, or by raising contention within it, or by refusing to submit and yeeld obedience to the lawfull Pastors and Guides thereof.

Thus the Corinthians were Schismaticques, in that they diuided themselves into factions, and caused dissensions in the Church, whereby the societie of the faithfull was disturbed and diuided into sundrie partiall Sects, the one holding of *Apollos*, the other of *Paul*, and the third of *Cephas*, 1. *Cor.* 1. 10. 11. 12. 1. *Cor.* 3. 3. 4.

Yea in Rites and Ceremonies they dissented one from another, and auoyded one anothers communion, as damnable. 1. *Cor.* 11. 16. 17. 18.

And the Defender confesseth, that he that *rayseth up dissension among Brethren*, is a Schismaticque, though he doth not separate himselfe from the Church. *Milde Def.* pag. 48.

Separation two-fold.

As for *Separation*, it is two-fold: for a Man may separate himselfe, either *absolutely from the whole Militant Church*, being caried away with error of mind; and such is not in the Church. Or, by reason of some infirmitie, or perturbation of mind, because of offences, he may separate himselfe *from this or that particular Church*: Such may be of the Church, seeing he is but rent from this or that member, not from the whole body.

NW.

It is one thing to be cut off from the *Body*, and another thing to be cut from a *Member* of the body. He that is cut from

Arg. 3. THE MILD DEFENCE. 113

from the Body, hath nothing common with the body. He that is cut from a Member, may be, both formally by the Spirit, and also materially by touch and cohesión of some other member; ioyned to the body. Now every particular Church, is a member of that Catholique body.

Also, the *Vnitie of the Church* may be considered two waies: for either it is *Internall and formall* by the Spirit of Christ, in faith; or it is *Externall and materiall*, in the profession, exercises and signes of faith. The former may really consist without the later; but not contrariwise, the later without the former. For a Schismaticke may breake the externall Vnion, without breaking the Internall.

Neither do I speake this, any way to extenuate the crime of this kind of Schisme: for certainly euen this is a most pernicious Sinne; because such a Schismaticke, as much as in him lieth, destroyeth both himselfe and the whole Church also.

Which that we may the better vnderstand, we must call to minde the Philosophers distinction of the *WHOLE*, which is of two sorts. There is one *WHOLE*, euery part whereof is *of the same kind*; as earth, water, blood, salt, milke, &c. If diuision be made of any of these, the powers of the whole do after a sort perish: for by that separation and plucking in sunder, it is much weakened; yet in the parts the nature of the whole is preserved; for euery part of earth is earth, of water water, &c. There is another *WHOLE*, euery part whereof is *of diuers kind*; Such be all liuing creatures and plants, made of diuers members and parts. If a man diuide these, then neither the Whole, nor the parts can remaine. A man, being drawn asunder into parts, ceaseth to be a man.

Now the Church, being a bodie composed of diuers parts, when it is diuided, both it selfe after a sort is ruined, and the parts thereof being distracted doe perish.

Schisme is two-fold, *Pure*; or *Mixed with Heresie*.

Pure Schisme, is that whereby the Vnitie of the Church is broken, either by separation, or other contumacie; not

S

withstanding

Vnitie considered two waies.

N.

WHOLE
two-fold.

NW.

Schisme two-fold.

1. Pure.

124 A REIOYNDER TO *Arg.3.*

withstanding that such retaine an intire profession of the truth of God.

2. *Mixed with Heresie.*

Schisme mixed with Heresie, is that wherein together with the departure or contumacie, there is ioyned some error in matters of faith. Which likely happeneth in the end of all Schismes; euery one being desirous to iustifie his disobedience and contumacie, or departure from the rest of Gods people.

The difference
betwene
Schisme and
Heresie.

Schisme differeth from Heresie.

1 Because *Heresie* holdeth some false point of doctrine: *Schisme* breaketh societie to defend it.

2 *Heresie* overthroweth the sinceritie of faith: *Schisme* hurteth the bond of peace.

3 *Heresie* in the beginning thereof holdeth some peruerse opinion: *Schisme* in the end bringeth soorth Heresie.

4 *Schisme* is as it were the generall kinde: *Heresie* the speciall kinde. For euery Heresie is a Schisme; but not contrariwise, euery Schisme an Heresie.

5 *Schisme* is a certaine disposition: *Heresie* an indurate habite.

6 *Heresie* may bee kept secret a long time: *Schisme* is presently discovered.

Schisme may
be,

1. In *Externall things.*

2. In *profession.*

3. In *Ceremonies,*

4. In *phrases and words.*

Again, Schisme is either in *Externall things*, as in the choice of Bishops, or other Gouvernours and Pastors of the Church. Or in the *Profession of life*, as the diuers orders of Monkes and Friers, wherein euery Sect followeth a diuers rule or way to attaine eternall life, condemning all other different from it. Or in *Rites and ceremonies* of religion, as that of the keeping of Easter. Or in *Phrases and strife of words*, as is that concerning the reall presence among the Reformed Churches, and of Christs Passion and Descent into hell with vs.

N W.

Furthermore, Schisme euen from the originall thereof proceedeth from euill. For all good is vnited, not diuided: and GOD, the auctor of all good, is one, simple, without diuision.

Amongst

Arg. 3. THE MILD DEFENCE. 125

Amongst *Schismatiques*, some are greater sinners than other: neither are all induced to bee such, vpon the same grounds and reasons.

Some Schismatiques greater sinners, then others.

For, Some are carried with *hatred towards their brethren*: with which vice the Donatists seeme to haue been infected in *Augustines* time.

Others are lead by *ambition and desire of rule*: Many such schismes haue happened in the Synagogue of Antichrist, at what time there were two, or three, or foure Popes together at once.

Others are carried with *blind affection* and fauour towards mens persons: such were the Corinthians in the Apostles time; and such at this day are those fond Preachers that, not caring for truth, labour to please men.

Others follow factions of *meere ignorance* of the truth, who are the more tolerable, if their ignorance be not willfull and affected: such were the people in Christs time (*Ioh. 7. 12. 40. 41. 42. 43.*) For some said of Christ, *He is a good man*. Other said, *noy, but he deceiueth the people*. Some said, *Of a truth this is that Prophet*. Other said, *This is that Christ*. And some said, *But shall Christ come out of Galile?* &c. So there was (saith Iohn) *a Schisme among the people*.

Others are puffed vp with *admiration of their owne vertues*, or with a vaine perswasion of their owne holinesse: Such were the Catharists or Puritanes in the daies of *Tertullian*, who sought for pure assemblies.

Others flie out by reason of *discontentments and want of preferments*: of which sort we haue too many examples in our daies.

I neede not particularly to applie these things, either vnto the *Bronnists*, who haue separated themselves from vs; or vnto the *refratarie Ministers*, who are disobedient vnto their lawful Gouvernours amongst vs, and disquiet our Church with Contentions. These grounds, which I haue laid, are so plaine and easie; that (I thinke) there is not any man so simple, but may manifestly discerne how, and in

what sense they are, and may be rightly termed Schismatiques.

How Schisme
may be excu-
sed.

If it be demanded; *Whether in any case Schisme may be excused?*

I answer; It may so, in some speciall cases.

I. Necessitie excuseth Schisme: namely when good men are publikely expelled and banished, and violently put out of their Churches, so that they can haue no place left them, neither among the Teachers, nor among the hearers. As at this day we see whole families and assemblies compelled to flie out of their owne countrie, and to liue in exile for Religion sake.

II. When the sinceritie of faith is so corrupt, that holysome doctrine (as the Apostle speaketh) can bee neither taught, nor learned; the godly may depart. For agreement and vnitie is commendable onely in the truth; if truth be away, wee ought to make no question of agreement and vnitie.

III. When the Sacraments are so corruptly administred, that there is not scarce any step to be seene of Christs institution; There is no doubt but a man may lawfully separate himselfe from that societie which retaineth not true Doctrine and the lawfull vse of the Sacraments.

Obiections of
the Brownists
and Refracta-
ries.

But here both the *Separatists* and the *Refractaries* step in, and labour to defend their Schisme, alleaging; 1. *That we liue not according to our doctrine, neither Ministers, nor people.* 2. *That whereas we abound with wickednesse yet we admit euery one promiscuously vnto the Lords Supper, without further censure or discipline.* 3. *That we vse Popish ceremonies in the Worship of God.*

Answe.

I answer, generally: These are no iust and sufficient causes, to make a Schisme, as appeareth in that the truth of doctrine and puritie of faith, consist not in these things: which whilest they grant vnto vs, they condemne themselves in that they haue inconsiderately made a schisme from vs without iust cause.

Neither

Arg. 3. THE MILD DEFENCE. 127

Neither is it any hard matter, to answer all their arguments in particular, excepting the first.

Touching the *Ministers* therefore; It is most certaine, Of Scandalous Ministers
that a faithfull Minitter of Christ ought not onely to know the will of God, but also to do thereafter. What *Paul* spake of the Law, that *not the hearers, but the doers thereof should be iustified*, (*Rom. 2. 13.*) that Christ speaketh of his Disciples, (*Ioh. 13. 17.*) *If you know these things, happy are you if you do them.* But it cannot bee denied but that some Ministers offend this way, which how they will answer before God, let themselves looke vnto. For my owne part, I can say no more of such Ministers, than what Christ saith of the Scribes and Pharisees, (*Mat. 23. 2. 3.*) *They sit in Moses chaire: All therefore what formerly they bid you obserue, that obserue and doe; but after their works do not; for they say and do not.* It ought to content vs, that they teach true doctrine; and that they liue not thereafter, it hurteth not me, for they shall carrie their owne burdens. The doctrine is ours; the life is theirs: let vs take the doctrine, and leaue the manners. I had rather haue a sincere Preacher of Gods Word, that will declare Christ vnto me purely, rebuke my sinful liuing, comfort me with the sweete promises of the Gospell, shew me how I ought to frame my life according to the will of God, &c. albeit his manners be somewhat corrupt, and dissent from his preaching; then to haue a wicked Heretique, a pestilent Pharisee, or a superstitious Hypocrite, who outwardly shall pretend a certaine grauitie, and a pure manner of liuing, and yet corrupt the holy Scriptures, leade the people into superstitious errors, flatter the hearers, preach for lucre, mangle the doctrine of Christ, and obscure the way of truth. Of such Christ warneth vs to take heed saying, (*Matth. 7. 15.*) *Beware of false Prophets which come to you in sheepes cloathing, but inwardly are rauening wolues.* These things our Schismatiques know very well; but not contented herewith, they vrge; *Such a man was unworthie to be admitted, and now being in the Ministerie, he ought to be put out*; which I leaue to the Magistrates, and such as be in auctoritie to consider of.

Of Scanda-
lous People.

As for the *People*: the Separatists and Refractories do li-
mite and hedge in the Church too narrowly and straightly.
It is very lamentable indeed, that the doctrine of truth is
not heard with more fruit; yet do they offend, who looke
for pure assemblies in earth, without spot or blemish. Christ
compareth the Gospell vnto a net, that containeth fish and
filth: and the Lords field hath in it both good corne and
tares; which yet must not be weeded out, vntill haruest be
come. Vainely therefore doe they labour to seeke pure as-
semblies; albeit if they would looke into their owne socie-
ties, it may be they might finde therein as many Sinners as
are in ours. But these men ought to content themselves, as
the godly haue euer done, that the wicked being knowne
cannot hurt the faithfull; who either haue no auctoritie to
curbe them, or cannot otherwise prouide for publique
peace, then by tolerating such. And yet there want not in
the meane time publique Lawes and penalties to restrain
and bridle such as be notorious offenders.

Of promiscu-
ous admission
to the Com-
munion.

That which they speake concerning the *Communion*, is
very inconsiderate also and foolish: seeing neither Christ,
nor the Apostle *Paul*, did euer speake any thing at all, con-
cerning the censuring and examining of others; But com-
mand only that euery man should examine himselfe. Christ
celebrated his Supper with his weake Disciples, and admit-
ted *Indus* to be partaker thereof, as many excellent Diuines
do hold. *Paul* expressly commandeth, that euery man *exa-
mine himselfe*. It is my dutie to looke vnto my selfe, and
thine vnto thy selfe, & of euery other vnto himselfe. So that
a faithfull Minister seemeth to haue sufficiently discharged
his dutie, if he shall diligently admonish the Communi-
cants hereof, and not curiously prie into the secrets of other
men. Concerning manifest crimes the Church hath prescri-
bed Lawes of admonition, of Counsell, &c. If any list to
communicate contemning these; I see not how any man
may exclud those from the Communion, whom God the
Father, and Christ Iesus admit their grieuets: neither doest
thou know what God may worke in a Sinner, euen in that
very

Arg. 4. THE MILD DEFENCE. 129

very houre. It is not a signe of an ingenuous and charitable miad, to depart because of Sinners, whom Christ inuitheth to come vnto him. The Apostle saith, (2.Tim. 2. 20.) *In a great house there are not only vessels of gold and siluer, but also of wood and of earth, &c.* we must endeouour, that we may be vessels of gold and siluer: God only is to breake the vessels of earth in pieces.

As touching that we vse Popish Ceremonies in the Worship of GOD, that appears otherwise, in my booke *De Adiphoris*, whereunto I referre the Reader.

Many men moue this Question. *Whether Schismaticus ought to be compelled to vnite?* I answered; Compulsion seemeth to be hard, specially in such things as ought to be voluntarie. *Augustine* confesseth, that he was once of mind, that neither Schismaticus, nor Heretiques ought to bee compelled. (*Lib. Retract. cap. 5.*) But afterwards hauing by vse and experience learned what good a little discipline would effect, he alreth his opinion, and plainly defendeth, that Schismaticus ought by all meanes to be compelled to concord and vnite.

Whether
Schismaticus
may be com-
pelled.

Yet herein great moderation ought to be vsed: we must otherwise deale with the *Autors* of Schisme, and such as be stubborne and wilfull; than with such as of meere ignorance and preposterous zeale of pietie, are *Seduced* by others. But I leaue this vnto the graue and religious consideration of the wise Magistrates.

IV. ARGUMENT.

Such whom the Lord hath made his instruments, for the spirituall deliuerance of many thousands from spirituall enemies, are to be respected and recompensed.

Ergo,

Ergo, The refractarie Ministers are to be remembred and restored.

ANSVVERE.

I

Answer.

THis Argument is parallel vnto the former, and is there fully answered.

II.

The Ministers, in *deliuering thousands from spirituall enemies*, did but their duty, for which they deserue loue of the people, and commendation of all men: but they should stil haue continued faithful in their Ministry, and not shamefully haue forsaken their calling.

Reply.

The Defender replies. *If men should alwaies be so answered, when in their necessities they should require some helpe and comfort: in regard of some former kindnesse; would not men condemne such Answerers of great ingratitude and inhumanitie? viz. thus to be answered, That which you haue done, was but your dutie?*

Reioynder.
The Defen-
ders malici-
ous dealing.

But with what conscience doth this man write; that indeed of the second answere vnto this Argument, layeth downe only these words, *The Ministers did but their dutie* &c. suppressing the rest of the Answer, and then shapes his Reply in most bitter manner, to perfwade all men, that I had neither common humanitie, nor compassion, nor feeling of their miserie: whereas the Lord knoweth, my heart many times yerneth for sorrow, when I thinke of our domesticall controversies, which would God I might appease and reconcile, that so the Church might enioy rest and quietnes, though it were with the effusion of my dearest BLOOD. In the meane time, I feele oftentimes such inward pangues and griefe, that (I thinke) the Defender hath neuer bin acquainted with the like. Neither could my compassionate af-
fection

Arg. 4. THE MILD DEFENCE. 131

fection towards the refractarie Ministers, be altogether vnknowne vnto this wrangling Aduocate, if he had not already made shipwracke both of ingenuitie and conscience. For euen in this very Answer, which he mangleth and curtolizeth at his pleasure, he might haue seene, that I acknowledge, that for their labour and diligence in the Ministerie, the Ministers *deserne loue of the people, and commendation of all men.* Also in the Argument going before, *It is true, Good deedes must be rewarded, specially the Ministers faithfull labours, &c.* And lastly (to omit diuers other places) in the Conclusion, *I cannot but griue in my very soule, when I heare the Ministers complaine of their pouertie, and want of the benefits of this life, &c.* And againe, *Loe the malice, the enuie and spite, which we, whom they terme their Accusers, doe beare vnto them, GOD being witness vnto our consciences, that we wish them all the good that may be.* These things whilest the Defender dissemblesh, how is he as good as his promise, where he saith, *I will collect his words with such faithfulness, that the Answerer shall haue no iust cause to complaine of the said collections, as vniust, or not agreeing to his owne words* (*Mild Defence pag. 1.*) What iustice is it, to take only a piece of a sentence, and to racke that vpon the tecture-hooke of malicious construction, directly against the Auctors meaning?

III.

I nathans example, alleadged by the Suppliants, Answered. is vnlike vnto Ministers case. For *Saul* in deepe hypocrisie, had made a rash vow, that whosoever did *taste any food, &c.* (*1 Sam. 14. 24.*) should be *accursed, and die the death*, wherefore the people iustly rescued him from the furie of *Saul*. But the actions of our dread Soueraigne are not so exorbitant, they are not rash and headie, but aduised and iust, intended for vnitie and quietnesse in the Church, to preuent and repress phanaticall giddinesse, schisme, factions and innoation.

T

The

Reply.

The Defender replies. *See how wise the children of this world are in their kinde? The auctor altogether wisely and purposely (as it seemeth) concealed the name of Saul in the Argument, that so the worke might be generally and simply respected in it selfe, without any particular eye vnto Saul, out of whose hands the people deliuered Iouathan. If the Israelites iustly rescued Iouathan, as the Answerer confesseih they did iustly, much more iust is it, that many Ministers should be rescued in their troubles.*

Reply.

I thinke the Auctor of the Supplication is but little beholding vnto the Defender, for ranging him amongst the Children of this world, a phrase in Scriptures properly belonging vnto the Reprobates. But I answer vnto the Reason. The fallacie is, *ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ μὴ δύναν, ὡς δύναν.* For hee maketh that lesse, which is not lesse: there was greater reason for rescuing of *Iouathan*, being the auctor of so great deliuerance, from the furie of *Saul*, who hypocritically without warrant from God, had vowed that *whosoener should taste any foode &c. should die the death*; than there is for the rescuing of the refractarie Ministers from the iust execution of Law vpon them: as well because by their willfull obstinacie in perseuering singular and forsaking their calling, they are not the auctors of *deliuerance*, but rather of *destruction* to Gods people; as also because the punishment inflicted vpon them, is not vniust and vnderferued, as *Iouathans* should haue been, but iust and deserued for their schismaticall cariage, &c.

V. ARGVMENT.

Supplicat.

Many spake earnestly; yea and some haue aduentured their liues in behalfe of the Church of God, as *Nehemiah*, *Hester*: so also did *Ioseph* of Arimathea,

Arg. 5. THE MILD DEFENCE. 133
thea, and Nicodemus for Christs bodie.

Ergo, So should the high Court of Parliament do for the refractarie Ministers and for whole Christ.

ANSWERE.

I. To the Antecedent.

THe zeale and courage of such as haue been earnest, or aduentured their liues and estate in Gods cause, for defence of his eternall truth and Church, is certainly much to be commended and imitated (to their vtmost power) of all such as desire to be called, and be indeed members of the Church of God: but it would be wisely considered, that it were rashnesse and foole-hardinesse, for any to aduenture hazard, or manifest danger, by intermeddling in a friuolous and vnneccessarie quarell, and much more for such cause as cannot be iustified by any probable reason.

The Defender replies. *Except by a friuolous quarell, and a Replie. cause not iustificable, you meane not the cause of the Ministers; you speake nothing to the purpose. If you meane that (as needes you must) then doe you not speake to vs poore Ministers alone, but also to the Parliament, and to all other (Noblemen, or Gentlemen) that haue intermeddled, or shall intermeddl in our cause. Yea, them doe you not cunningly, but openly and plainly, charge all such with rashnes and foole-hardines.*

What should moue the Defender, to imagine that I Reioynder. meane any other Cause, but the Ministers? I meane no other indeed; and yet it followeth not, that therefore I censure the Parliament house, &c. or charge them with rash-

nes and foole-hardines. For the Parliament house is not of their faction and straine, as wee haue noted before. What they deserue for this their continuall insolencie and malepertnes in standing the high Court of Parliament, I referre vnto the religious censure of that noble and wise Assemblie.

II. To the Consequence.

I

Answer. This Consequence hath no coherence with the Antecedent. For there are great ods betweene these examples proposed, and the refractarie Ministers. case.

Reply. The Defender replieth. *There should be such ods. For the Auctor reasoneth not à similibus, or paribus, from likes or equals, but from the lesse to the greater.*

Reioynder. But the oddes are such, that they make the Argument to be plainly insequent: for the Auctor of the Supplication makes that lesse, which is every way greater, as shall appeare in examining the particulars.

II.

Answer. In the time of *Nehemiah*, the Church of the Iewes, hauing been long captiuated, was in great affliction and reproach, and the walles of *Hierusalem* were broken downe. (*Nehem. 1.3.*) which was not so in the daies of their Fathers. But our Church hauing (by the mercies of God) now long continued in prosperous and flourishing estate, is (God be thanked) glorious still, yea more now, then euer it was in the daies of our Fathers. Furthermore, *Nehemiah*, after he had wept, mourned, fasted and prayed, (*Nehem. 1.4.*) spake vnto King *Artashaste*, an Heathen and prophane man, and finding grace in his eyes, obtained leaue to build vp *Hierusalem*. (*Nehem. 2.6.*) But *Sanballat*, *Tobiah*, *Geshem* and others deriding and despising the Iewes,

Arg. 1. THE MILD DEFENCE. 135

Iewes, laboured to hinder the worke, but preuailed not (*Nehem. 2. 19. and 4. 7. 15.*) Then *Nehemiah* prayed, *My God, remember thou Tobiah and Sanballat, according vnto these their workes.* (*Nehem. 6. 14.*) So euen in the very beginning of our religious Soueraignes raigne, many worthy *Nehemiahs* finding grace in his eyes, haue moued his Maiestie for the continuance of the prosperous estate of our Church, as it was in the daies of our late blessed Queene, albeir his Highnesse was more readie to graunt their request, then they to aske it. And now so many *Sanballats, Tobiahs,* and *Geshems*, as there be refractarie Ministers and Papists, deriding and despising vs, labour to hinder our Ministerie, blaspheming the same, either to be none at all, or adulterate and very corrupt, but (God willing) shall not preuaile. And we still thinking that most of them do sinne of ignorance, cease not to pray vnto God: *O Lord, open the eyes of these men, and lay not this sinne to their charge.*

The Defender replies. *All things being granted that you* Reply. *say (concerning the glorie of our Church) doth not hinder, but further the cause. The more the Church flourisheth, the more easie it is to grant that, which the Arguments pleads for. Ministers also of the Word are as necessarie for preserving and increasing of the glorie of Churches, as for the procuring thereof at the first.*

Not hinder? If our Church be glorious and flourishing Reioynder. both in the entire and sound profession and practise of Gods truth, in the exercises, meanes, and signes of faith, (which is the true and principall glorie of the Church) and also in the outward state, Discipline and Gouernment thereof (which Glorie is secundarie and depending of the former) how can it bee, but that giddie innouation, the vnter ouerthrow of Ecclesiasticall policie, and the bringing

in of the Presbyterian prelacie, euen almost equalizing Papall tyrannie, should be a maine blemish, and vncurable maime vnto the *G L O R I E* of our Church? It is true indeed: that the *Ministers of the Word* are necessarie for preserving and encreasing of the glorie of Churches; but are there no Ministers, but such as be refractarie? Haue we not store (God be prayed) of sufficient religious Ministers alreadie? And are not the Vniuersities able continually to afford farther supplie?

Reply.

But alas, saith the Defender, I would God our Church did so flourish, as you pretend: Indeed it hath many rich mercies, God be blessed for them; but he that seeth not what the Church wanteth, doth not rightly acknowledge that which it hath. We want some of those Officers, that Christ hath commended by his Apostles to the Church, What Christian heart is so stonie, that it doth not mourne; what eye so blind, that it doth not gush out with teares, to consider and behold the miserie of our supposed glorious Church, by the spirituall nakednes, blindnes, and pueritie thereof? I meane the great ignorance, the superficiall worship of God, the fearefull blasphemies and swearings in houses and streetes, the direfull cursings, the open contempt of the Word and Sacraments, the wicked prophanations of the Lords daies, the dishonor of superiours, the pride, the crueltie, the fornications, adulteries and other uncleanneses, the drunkenes, the cometonnes, the vsuries, and other the like abominations; almost as grievous, as either heretofore in the time, or now in the places of Poperie, when and where there was no preaching at all of the Gospel? O behold and pittie the wofull and lamentable state of our Church in these things!

Reioynder.

What maruell is it, that the Owle cannot SEE, in a cleare Sun-shining day, whose only delite is to flutter, and to roue about in the profound darknesse of the night? And can any man thinke it strange, that the Defenders eyes dazle at the Glorie and goodly order of our Church, when nothing pleaseth him, but that *Aerian* or Presbyterian confusion? Oh, but there want some Officers in our Church, which Christ commended vnto vs, by his Apostles. What Officers be those?

ô they

Arg. 1. THE MILD DEFENCE. 137

ð they are the Lay Presbyterian Aldermen. *Hinc illa lacrimae*; heere lyeth the soare a bleeding. We want the supposed Apostolicall Senate of Aldermen; and for this cause, we are spirituallly naked, and blind, and poore, and miserable, and what not? But when wil the Defender proue, that either Christ, or his Apostles commended any such Aldermen vnto vs? Shall we beleue him on his bare word? What other prooffe brings he, or any other of the faction? And yet vpon this most beggerly Supposition, neuer granted by vs, because neuer proued, nor able to be proued by them; he openeth his foule mouth, most wickedly traducing and slandering the Church of GOD, as guiltie of *great ignorance, of superficiall worship of GOD, of blasphemies, swearings, direfull cursings*, and many other horrible and monstrous enormities, which my pen doth euen blush to relate after him. We reade (1. King. 22. 21. 22.) of a wicked Spirit, that liberally promised his seruice in seducing King *Ahab*, by being a lying Spirit in the mouth of all his Prophets: Except this foule fiend hath entred into the Defender, and wholly possessed him; I cannot possibly imagine, how his pen could so leasingly raue against our whole Church. I beseech the Lord, that hee would vouchsafe, to rebuke the euill Spirit, and to giue the Defender grace to repent him in time, by confessing his malice against the Church of God. But let vs heare what he saith further.

The Defenders slanders against the Church.

But to returne, herein you erre not a little, in that you confound the state of the Church, and of the Common-wealth of the Iewes. The Common-wealth was indeede at that time in much miserie. But was the Church also amongst them, for such things as wherein chiefly consisteth miserie, in as bad condition?

Reply.

Doe I confound the Church and Common-wealth of Reioynder. the Iewes? Was not the CHURCH in distresse, being but lately returned from the Captiuitie of *Babylon*? Can the Common-wealth be in extreame miserie, and the Church haue no feeling thereof? Was not the Temple at *Hierusalem* the speciall place of Gods worship, which now, by reason

son of the desolation of the Citie, was but little regarded, and the lawes not executed? Did not *Nehemiah*, after his returne from *Artasbaste*, reforme many things as well in the Church, as in the Common-wealth? It seemes the Defender cares not what he writes, so he contradicts my sayings. But he proceedeth.

Reply.

The ods that before he spake of, now he maketh likes. Is this to dispute ad idem, and to the purpose?

Reioynder.

As I said before, so I say still, that there is GREAT ODS betweene the example of *Nehemiah*, and the refractarie Ministers case. And doe I now make those ODS *LIKES*? Nay contrariwise, I make *Nehemiah*s case to be *OVERS*, and the refractarie Ministers, *Tobiah*s, *Sanballats* and *Geshems*. Is not this *ad idem*, and to purpose? Where is the Defenders understanding?

Reply.

Touching his worthe Nehemiah (whom he compareth to ancient good Nehemiah) let this be observed, that although he spake of the prayer and fasting of the ancient Nehemiah, yet he speaketh not of the prayer and fasting of his new Nehemiah. What may be suspected or noted herein, I leane to the consideration of the wise and iudicious Reader, that remembereth what oppositiō many of the Prelats haue alwaies made to true fasting.

Reioynder.

I spake not of ONE, but of MANY worthy *Nehemiah*s: neither needed these to haue fasted and prayed; the Church being not then afflicted, as it was in ancient *Nehemiah*s daies: and (I thinke) the Defender is not ignorant, that *Similitudes runne not with foure feete*, as the Proverbe is. As for the Opposition of many of the Prelats to true fasting, it is utterly vntrue that any Prelat euer opposed himselfe against true fasting, except it were peraduenture against the disordered conuenticles, and presumptuous practises of some hare-brained Refractaries, contrary vnto all good Discipline and order.

Reply.

Touching the Tobiahs, Sanballats, and Geshems (whom saine he would haue to be those that he calls refractarie Ministers, as well as the Papists) let him not deceiue himselfe herein. For the wise and Christian Readers, are able to discerne them to be

Arg. 5. THE MILD DEFENCE. 139

be most worthy of these names, that strine most for mens precepts, that studie more to please men then God, that preach not themselves, and binder them that would: whose chiefe work is not to encrease God his kingdom, but to uphold their owne, fearing nothing more, then the downefall thereof: which also feed not the Lords people, with the bread of eternal life, but their owne bodies with the meate that perishest, and with carnall delights, &c. but the righteous Lord in the end shall plead our cause, if not in this life, yet in the world to come, when some of our adversaries (without repentance in the meane time) shall be throwne into the place, wherein is weeping and gnashing of teeth.

Cease your rash iudgement, and restrain your censuring Reioynder. and lying Spirit, if you can awhile; and turne the back-
side of the wallet before you: then consider, that they most aptly resemble *Tobiah*, *Sanballat* and *Geshem*, who by tooth and naile labour to let the building of the spirituall *Hiernusalem*, by withdrawing their seruice, breaking vniue, and disturbing the peace of the Church; of which sort are both the refractarie Ministers and the Papiſts, who are as guiltie herein, as were *Tobiah*, *Sanballat*, and *Geshem*, for hindering the building of the materiall *Hiernusalem*.

The refractarie Ministers like vnto *Tobiah* and *Sanballat*.

Moreouer whereas I had said, that I thought that most of the refractarie Ministers and Papiſts did sinne of ignorance, the Defender replieth, *See how this man tumbled vp and Reply. downe, and how he contradicted himselfe? Hath not he before expressly charged all of vs, to do that which we do for carnall respects? I meane in his Preface.*

See how the Defender iugleth vp and downe! 1. Are not Reioynder. my words spoken as well of the Papiſts, as of the refractarie Supposed Ministers? 2. What is in my Preface contrarie to what I affirmed heere; or rather, doth not the Defender, by some iugling trick, suppress some words in my Preface, whereby Contradiction. deceiuing his Reader, he might perswade a contradiction? The words are these;

It cannot be denied, but that the Ministers presumptuously and wilfully contend with the Magistrate,

strates, impugning his auctority in *Things indifferent*, and soueraigntie in *Ecclesiasticall causes*, which all of them do for carnall respects: Some because they know not otherwise how to be maintained, but by depending vpon that faction; some to gratifie their benefactors and patrons, and to please their friends; some for discontentment and want of preferment; some for giddines of innouation; some for pride of heart and selfe loue; some for hatred of order and restraint of their libertie; some still to retaine the opinion of constancie in perseuering singular; and others OF MEERE IGNORANCE, which yet is wilfull and affected, seeing they will not learne the state of the Controuersie, which they are bound to know, and therefore cannot be excused.

What? Haue not I named IGNORANCE heere amongst the rest? and is not Ignorance carnall? Where then is the Contradiction? Let the Reader iudge.

III.

Answer.

In the daies of the noble and renowned *Queene Hester*, all the Iewes should haue been swallowed vp by the tyrannie of *Haman*, had not that vertuous Queene, by aduenturing her owne life, deliuered her people from destruction. But I hope the Suppliants do not thinke our Church to be in so desperate a state, neither outwardly, nor spiritually: and if they do, yet none can be so foolish as to beleue it.

Reply.

The Defender replieth. *May we feare nothing to our whole Church and Kingdome, for the hard dealing of the Prelats towards the soules of many thousands of our owne Nation? Let no man deceiue vs with vaine words; Blessed is the man that feareth alwaies. There is danger in securitie, there is much more safetie in a godly feare. As for the spirituall danger of the Church,*

*Ephes. 5. 6.
Prou. 28. 14.*

Arg.s. THE MILD DEFENCE. 141

Church, it appeareth by the decay of the spirituall beautie; and by the encrease of the spirituall deformitie; that is, of ignorance and of impietie in those places already which are deprived of their good Ministers.

But what is this, to proue that the example of *Q. Hester* Reioynder. was rightly alledged by the Suppliants, to prouoke the high Court of Parliament, to speake for the refractarie Ministers? The danger of the Church in *Hesters* time was very great and imminent: The danger of our Church (God be thanked) is but an extaticall imagination of the Suppliants and Defenders braines. Oh, but the *hard dealing of the Prelats towards many thousand Soules*, ought to cause vs to feare continually. What? Is the removing of SCHISMATIKES, and the stopping of the mouthes of such clamorous wranglers, as stirre vp dissention and discord in the Church, hard dealing towards mens soules? Who will say so, besides the Refractories, and their abettors, the Brownists? But how doth this *Elymas* peruert that saying of Scripture, *Blessed is the man that feareth alwayes*, (*Pro. 28.14.*) Is this feare meant of the feare of punishment? Nay, let him remember, that GOD will send FEARE vpon the wicked, where no feare is: that such as obserue not Gods commandements, shall feare day and night, (*Deut. 28.66.*) that the same which the Wicked feareth, shall come vpon him, (*Prou. 10.24.*) As for his slandering our Church with decay of Spirituall bewtie in those places, which are deprived of their good Ministers; if it be so, then woe vnto them by whom the offence commeth, that so easilie gaue place vnto the Wolfe: But I maruell he was not ashamed, so impudently to auerre that, which all the Land and daily experience testifieth to be an impious Calumnies.

IV.

The examples of *Ioseph of Arimathea* and *Nicodemus*, are altogether impertinent: for neither had *Pilate* any reason, to deny the buriall of Christs body being dead: nor is the Ministers request, concerning

142 A REIOYNDER TO *Arg. 5.*
Crosse and Surplice any thing of such importance,
as was the buriall of Christs body. For it is not true
that they contend about *Whole Christ Iesus*, and the
Ministerie of the Gospell, as the Suppliants heere sug-
gest.

Reply. The Defender replieth. *The Argument speaketh of the ho-
norable buriall of Christs bodie: the Answerer only of the buri-
all, leaving out honorable; is not this Sophistrie?*

Reioynder. *Is not this Sophistrie?* Nay, is not this Knauerie? The ve-
ry words of the Argument are these (*pag. 7. of the Supplica-
tion*) Further to adde one other example briefly: *If fearesfull
Ioseph of Arimathea went boldly to Pilate, and ASKED THE
BODY OF IESVS. And if Nicodemus (before as fearesfull
as the said Ioseph) ioyned with him in the honorable buriall
thereof, &c. Did Ioseph of Arimathea desire of Pilate, that he
might HONORABLY burie the body of Iesus? This indeed
is the Defenders dreaming, or rather doating conceipt;
which neither the Auctor of the Supplication doth affirme;
nor can be proved by Scriptures. Search the text (*Matth.
27. 57. Mark. 15. 43. Luk. 23. 52. Ioh. 19. 38.*) and you shall
find that *Ioseph of Arimathea* asked the *Body of Iesus*; but
not a word spake he to *Pilate*, of the BVRIALL thereof,
much lesse of HONORABLE BVRIALL.*

Reply. The Defender vrgeth. *If the Ministers request concerning
Crosse and Surplice, be not of such importance, as the buriall of
Christs body, this weakeneth not, but addeth strength to the Ar-
gument. For the lesse it is, the more easly it may be granted, and
the more easly it may be granted, the more boldly it may be sued
for.*

Yes, it so weakeneth the Argument, that it ouerthroweth
it altogether. For the lesse that the thing desired by the Sup-
pliants is, the more ought they to be ashamed, in being so
troublesome vnto the honorable Court of Parliament to
intercede for them in so needlesse and small a suite.

VI. ARGUMENT.

Many Congregations, Men, Women, *Supplicat.*
Children, Masters and Seruants, of
all ages and conditions, are in great
heauinesse for their Pastors, and doe
make lamentable moane for them.

Ergo, The States of the Parliament must
needs be Suiters vnto his Maiestie for
restoring of them againe.

ANSVVER.

I. To the Antecedent.

I.

IF the Antecedent be true, as the Suppliants seeme *Answer.*
confidently to affirme, then surely the more hard
hearts haue those cruell Tyrants, rather then shep-
heards, that hauing no pitie, nor compassion vpon
those sillie sheepe, desperately forsake their flockes,
ouer whom the Lord had made them ouerseers; and
relinquish their vocation for litle or no cause at all.

The Defender replies two things. 1. *We must haue pitie Replie*
and compassion on our sheepe, that we wound not our owne soules.
We must (as hath been said) eschew euill, and doe good: not
commit euill, to doe good. As gold may be bought too deare, so
may the good of our people.

As if dutifully to obey the ordinances of our Church, Reioynder.
were to commit euill. Whereas indeed rebellion is as the
sinne of witchcraft, and he that resisteth the Magistrate shall
not be guiltlesse. The Error is *Εἰς τὸ πρῶτον τὸ ἐν τῷ*

2. *By the like Reason, a These may complaine of the hard- Reply.*

nes of his heart, that had rather lose his purse, than haue his throat cut.

Reioynder. The Reason is not like; for there is great ods betweene wearing a Surplice, and hauing ones throat cut, as euery man knoweth. How doth this reason argue? *As bee hath an hard heart, that had rather lose his purse, than haue his throat cut: So he hath an hard heart, that had rather lose his lining, than weare a Surplice.* The error, is *Ελαχὺ παρὰ τὸ μὲν ὄφειλεν*. And, *Ελαχὺ παρὰ τὸ ἐπὶ μὲν*.

II.

Answered. Those *Congregations, Men, Women, Children, &c.* may cease to mourne any longer, and comfort themselves herewith, *viz.* that seeing their vnfaithfull and vngratefull Pastors, haue dealt so vnkindly and vndutifully with them; yet (God be thanked) the Lord hath store of good & faithfull Seruants, which he will send forth into the Haruest, who both can and will breake the bread, and powre out the water of eternall life vnto them, and performe the duties of faithful Shepheards, that wil neuer forsake them, nor runne away when they haue most need of their helpe.

Reply. The Defender replies. *Those that will not runne away, where are they to be found? What net may one haue to catch them? what keepe to hold them? For doe not the FORMALISTS daily runne away from their people? Doe they not take another Lining, and keepe the former also, leaning one to some souney man fit for all companies? Yea both Master and man, oftentimes leaue both flocks to the Wolfe: yea I know some that forsake their owne charges, and are Curats elsewhere vnder other. And to whom doe some of them leaue their owne? To one that all the weeke long goeth to hedging, disching, threshing, and other day labour for his lining: who on the Lords day, is at Church with a White Surplice to reade Service, &c.*

Arg. 6. THE MILD DEFENCE. 145

If the *Formalist* be such a man, as the Defender paints him out in this place; would GOD our Church were fairly rid, as well of the *Formalist* (if any such be amongst vs) as of the refractarie Minister; seeing the one is as negligent and slothfull, as the other is schismaticall and factious; and both of them pernicious vnto Gods people. And let the Defender informe the Gouvernours of the Church of any such in the Ministerie, and I doubt not but he shall see all such persons either speedily reformed, or turned out of the Church. But if the Defender meanes by *Formalists*, all such Ministers, as be regular and obedient vnto the government and discipline of our Church, then hath hee entred againe into his Common place of Calumniation and lies, which needeth no further answer.

II. To the Consequence.

The Consequence followeth not from the Antecedent, but this rather; Ergo, *The Pastors must needs haue pitie vpon their miserable distresse, and obeying the wholesome ordinances of the Church, returne againe and comfort them.* Answer.

The Defender replieth. *We will returne againe to our people and comfort them, when the Ordinances of the Church, are proued by Gods Word to be wholesome.* Reply.

If your consciences be not yet perswaded of the wholesomenes and lawfulness of our Churches ordinances; wherefore do not you obiect any thing against our Bookes written purposely of that Argument? But I feare me, it fareth with many of you, as it doth with most part of the Papists in other things; to wit, that your wils and affections ought to be beaten downe, and terrified with Gods threatnings against cōtempuous and wilful impugnors of the knowne truth, rather then your iudgements reformed or rectified in these controuersies. I pray GOD forgieue you your wilfull obstinacie and contempt, and encline your hearts to embrace peace and vnitie; that at length we all may be one, as GOD the Father, and CHRIST IESVS are one. Reioynder.

VII. ARGVMENT.

Supplicat.

To regard the refractarie Ministers, is to regard the whole land, the States of Parliament, their Wiues and Children, the King and Kingdome.

Ergo, If the high Court of Parliament loue the safetie, peace, wealth, and glorie of King and Kingdome, and of themselues & theirs, they must speake and do what they may, for the Gospell and the Ministerie thereof.

ANSVVERE.

I

Answer.

WHat can a sensible man make of this *Enthymeme*? *The refractarie Ministers are the safetie of the whole land: Ergo, The Court of Parliament must speake for the Gospell.*

Reply.

The Defender replieth. *The title REFRACTARIE omitted, he is a senselesse man that can make nothing of that Enthymeme: especially these Ministers pleaded for being pronounced true and faithfull. For though the Gospell and the Ministers thereof be distinct, yet he that speaketh for one, speaketh for both, and he that speaketh for both, speaketh for the Land, the safetie whereof dependeth vpon both.*

Reioynder.
Note the Defenders skill in Logike

The Defender speakes so resolutely and confidently of this *Enthymeme*, that he should seeme to be some very profound & acute Logician. But let vs examine his skill a litle. Suppose that which is most false, to wit, that the Schismaticall

ticall

Arg. 7. THE MILD DEFENCE. 147

ricall Ministers are not refractarie, yea that they are not Schismaticall, that they are not disobedient vnto their lawfull Gouvernours, nor stirred vp dissention amongst vs; which is more, that they are good and faithfull Ministers. Suppose (I say) all this; What can a SENSIBLE Logician (not such a one as the Defender is) conclude out of this *Enthymeme*? *The Ministers* (whereof we speake) *are the safetie of the whole Land.* Ergo, *The Court of Parliament must speake for the Gospell.* How many termes hath this *Enthymeme*? Let vs reckon them. 1. *Ministers*, 2. *Safetie of the Land*, 3. *Court of Parliament*, 4. *The Gospell*. Can this *Enthymeme* be reduced into a *Syllogisme*, hauing foure termes? Here we want some of the Defenders skill to helpe vs. Yea but, *He that speakes for the Gospell, speakes for the Ministers thereof.* The Consequence is not necessary. But grant it so. Are there no other Ministers, but such as be Refractarie? The error, is *Ασυνεχία*. And, *Ελάττωσι τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ὅρων.*

II.

The Antecedent is very improbable, if not altogether false; both because there bee thousands of Godly faithfull Ministers in the Kingdome, which are not of their faction, that are as *Charets and Horsemen*: and also because the Ministers are therefore termed *Charets and Horsemen*, because they are Gods instruments for gathering of his Saints by the exercise of their Ministerie. But these men refuse to exercise their Ministerie; they haue relinquished and forsaken their calling: wherefore they can, by no reason, be termed *Charets and Horsemen*. And so far are they from being the *Safetie of the Land*, that would God they were not the Sores of the Church, and Sowers of sedition, I meane Schisme and faction.

The Defender replieth. *Generally throughout the whole Reply.*
Land,

Land, there are Sixe reading Ministers, for one Preacher; at the least, by practise. For there are some that are licensed to preach, that neuer did, are, or were able to preach. Many also that can preach, seldome doe preach. Some also that doe preach (and that often) do it so Popishly, or otherwise so corruptly; so foolishly and ridiculously, to make sport rather than to edifie; so vainely and vnprofitably, that it were better to hold their peace, then so to preach.

Reioynder. I defend not ignorant or negligent Ministers, neither also such as preach Popish, corrupt, or foolish doctrine: but hartily wish, that all such were either reformed or remoued. But sure I am that this speech of the Defenders, is a calumnious and lying *Hyperbole*, which if he were enforced to proue by particular *Induction*, he would come farre short of his reckoning. Whosoeuer in his Sermons taxeth their singularity and schisme, these men will presently calumniate him to preach *Popish, corrupt, foolish and ridiculous doctrine*. The Error, is *Diabolica*.

III.

Answer.

For the Consequence, I am sure it is from a Topique place called *A bsculo ad angulum*, from the Staffe to the corner: for it hath not the least coherence with the Antecedent, except the Suppliants meane that these words, *Refractarie Ministers*, the *Gospell*, the *Ministerie of the Gospell*, be conuertible termes: which is absurd and vnpossible.

To this the Defender Replieth NOTHING.

IIX. ARGVMENT.

Supplicat.

The Magistrate ought to execute iustice and iudgement, and to deliuer the oppressed.

Ergo,

Arg. 3. THE MILD DEFENCE. 149

Ergo, Much more ought the high Court of Parliament to do so, and to deliver the refractarie Ministers.

ANSVVERE.

To the Consequence.

THe Consequence hath two parts. 1. *That the Answerable Honorable Court of Parliament is to execute iustice and iudgement*; which I grant. 2. *That they ought to deliver and restore the refractarie Ministers*. That rests to be proued still: because they haue not yet iustified their cause, and declared that they are vniustly oppressed, nor can euer do.

The Defender replieth. *That the Ministers haue not yet Reply in Law (whereof the present question is) iustified their cause, and declared that they are vniustly oppressed, nor can euer do, is not for want of matter of Iustification, or for want of the truth of vniust oppression: but*

- I. *Because they haue not been admitted to appeale, and to prosecute the Iustice of the Land, nor to call in question the proceedings of their Ordinaries, vpon a pretense of a Canon lately made,* Grievances and Oppression pretended by the Refractarie Ministers.
- II. *Because some Ordinaries in their Sentences, haue vniustly and leasingly charged some Ministers, with the deniall of the Oath to the Kings supremacie: and stuffed their sentences full of generall crimes, contrary to the right forme of Iudgement.*
- III. *Because vpon notice giuen vnto the Patron of the amoydance of the Church, they haue not only instituted new Clerkes, but also intimated, that the possession of the Church was kept, per vim Laicam, whereby the partie appellat, hath been remoued out of his possession.*

IV. Because sundry Ordinaries upon appeals made before them, have taken order with their Registers and Notaries, not to deliver to the parties appellants, any note or copie, of any act or sentence made or given before them.

V. Because sundry Sentences of deprivation have been given, à Iudicibus non suis, namely by such, whose iurisdiction was suspended and shut up by the Arch. bishop of Canterburies Commission, and his Archiepiscopall Visitation.

VI. Because the whole power and iurisdiction by sundrie Dioceans was committed in solidum for tearme of life, unto their principall Commissaries, Officials, or Vicars generall, which they could not resume at their pleasure.

VII. Because Sentences have been given, nullo iuris ordine servato, but omni iuris ordine spreto & neglecto.

VIII. Because some Sentences have been given in some private Chamber of some common Inne or Taverne, and not in publico & competente foro.

IX. Because some Sentences have been given, not upon inquisition, information, or accusation, according to the Statute, but only upon proceffe, ex mero Officio.

X. Because some Ministers have been deprived only for not subscribing to the three Articles mentioned in the 36. Canon.

Reioyner.

Of the lawfulness of the proceedings against the refractarie Ministers.

Scriptures and Reasons not succeeding to the Suppliants and Defenders wish, nor sorting to that effect they purposed; now they have entered a more politique course, challenging the proceedings against the refractarie Ministers, in the Ecclesiasticall Courts, not to be iustifiable by Law, and pretending that they are dealt with, and grievously oppressed (forsooth) contrary to Law, as if they did cary a principall and zealous care to have all his Maiesties Lawes duly obserued.

For my owne part, I go not about to defend the fact and proceedings of particular men in this case of Deprivation, because

Arg. 2. THE MILD DEFENCE. 151

because I know not the circumstances whereby they were induced so to determine; neither haue I the leasure and meanes (at this instant) to enquire thereof; and I doubt not but the graue and wise Personages here traduced by the Defender, are able to answer for themselves, and sufficiently to iustify their proceedings against this Calumniator. Only I am (according to my poore ability) to maintaine the generall equitie of the proceedings, ordained and practised by the prescript and determination of our Church and State, against these factious Ministers. Wherefore I answer to these particular Grieuances, or branches of supposed Oppression.

To the 1. I. Factious Appellants, are denied prosecution of their friuolous and vniust appeales, because they are notorious perturbers of the peace of the Church; and the CANON made thereupon, seemeth to haue reference vnto a locall Statute of the Vniuersitie of OXFORD, whereby Nightwalkers, incontinent liuers, and such as commit any corporall violence, to the disturbance of the common quietnes of the Vniuersitie, are tearmed perturbers and breakers of the publique peace, and therefore are not permitted to prosecute the ordinarie course of appeales granted to others in Ciuill and Ecclesiasticall causes; with which kind of people, the refractarie and incorrigible Ministers are iustly to be ranked, as men that are not by the Iudge *ad quem* permitted to make their appeales, nor haue the ordinary times and termes of prosecution allowed them. For as by the Statutes of the said Vniuersitie, the *Iudices inhibitionum* are the Proctors, who are to tie the hands, and to shut the mouthes of all Iudges from proceeding or annulling such Sentences as are by them given, if they in their discretion shall thinke it fit, and by the Statutes are lawfull: So is the Archbishops Iudge *ad quem*, by the Decrees of the Conuocation, confirmed and ratified by the Kings auctoritie, prohibited, as the Proctors of the Vniuersitie are, to give passe to such factious Appellants. The equity of which restraint is apparant by the reason thereof,

Answ. to the
1. Grievance.
Of factious
Appellants.

inserted in the preable of the Canon (98.) cited by the Defender, Because they who breake the Lawes, cannot in reason claime any benefit or protection by the same. II. Conformable hereunto, it is decreed both in the *Cinill* and *Canon Lawes*: In the *Cinill* Law it is said. (*ff. lib. 49. tit. 1. de Appellationibus, l. 16.*) *Constitutiones quæ de recipiendis nec non appellationibus loquuntur, ut nihil noui fiat, locum non habent in eorum persona quos damnatos statim puniri publicè interest, ut sunt insignes latrones, vel seditionum concitatores, vel duces factionum.* Stirrers vp of sedition, and leaders of factions ought not to be permitted to appeale, but must be presently punished. (*Vide Bartol. ad lib. 49. Digest. de appellat. l. 16. Constitutiones.*) Also (*Cod. lib. 7. tit. 65. Quorum appellationes non recipiuntur. l. 2.*) the Emperours *Constantinus* and *Constantus* decree, that *Confessus non auditur appellans*: but the refractarie Ministers do not only CONFESSE, that they are such, but also wilfully PROFESSE that they will NEVER be conformable, and submit themselves vnto the Kings Ecclesiasticall Lawes and ordinances. Wherefore then should they be permitted to appeale? Againe in the Canon Law it is decreed, *Si verò publicum est & notorium* (eorum excessus) *appellationis obtentu non pratermittas, quin eos excommunicatos denuncies.* (*Decr. Greg. lib. 2. tit. 28. de appellationibus, cap. 13. Peruenit ad nos.*) If the Appellants crime or excess be publique and notorious, they are not permitted to appeale. (*Vide Glossam in vers. Notorium.*) Moreouer *Durandus* saith, *In delictis notorijs non admittitur appellatio*, (*Durand. Speculi lib. 2. part. 3. §. In quibus autem casibus. nu. 13.*) and *Maranta*, *Quarò principaliter limosa, non procedere* (appellationem) *in factis notorijs, quia in illis non admittitur appellatio*, (*Rob. Maranta Speculi aurei part. 6. Versic. Et quando appellatur. nu. 293.*) Now euery crime is NOTORIOUS by Confession (*Sext. Decr. lib. 2. tit. 15. de Appellat. cap. 3. Romana Ecclesia. §. Si autem in Gloss. Vers. Vel de quo.*) *Nec potest negari crimen per confessionem fore notorium.* In like manner *Panormitan* writeth, *Si verò Subditus communis à Prelato appellauerit, si eius excessus evidenti*

Arg. 3. THE MILD DEFENCE. 153.

*deniā rei, vel ipsius confessione, vel alio modo legitimo fuerit manifestus appellationi deferatur: cum appellationis remedium non fuerit institutum ad defensionem iniquitatis, sed ad praesidium innocentiae, (Panormit. de appellat. cap. 61. Cum speciali. §. Porro.) Also Durandus, Appellatio non debet esse praesidium iniquitatis, (Durand. Spec. lib. 2. part. 3. §. In quibus autem casibus, nu. 13.) And Maranta, Septimò limita, non procedere (appellationem) in Latrone insigni & famoso, item in Seditioso & auctore alicuius factionis: quia quicumq; damnatur de huiusmodi criminibus, vel altero ipsorum, non appellat, nec superseditur executioni, (Marant. Spec. anver. part. 6. Versic. Et quando appellatur, nu. 296.) The refractarie Ministers are required to conforme themselves, according to the order established. They refuse: and being proceeded against, they appeale. To what end? *ad perseverandum in malicia*, to continue still in their singularity and faction. Now who seeth not that such appeales are vniust and ynlawfull; seeing the remedy of Appeales was not ordained to bee a cloake and defence for wickednes; and *Appellatio frustratoria nunquam est admittenda*, (Durand. Spec. lib. 2. part. 3. §. In quibus autem casibus, nu. 33.) III. The proceeding against the Ministers, is according to the expresse letter and meaning of the Kings Lawes and Statutes; and whither would they appeale from the King? *Non appellatur à Principe*, (Durand. Spec. lib. 2. part. 3. §. Videndum à quibus appellari possit, nu. 15.) IV. It is the common course of all Iustice, after any contempt, first to obey the censure of the Court, and then to plead to the vniust proceedings pretended: and therefore do the Archbishops Iudges require nothing; but what the Kings Ecclesiasticall Lawes do prescribe.*

To the 2. There is not any man that will hastily beleewe, Answ. to the that any Ordinarie did euer vniustly, and leasngly charge 2. Grievance. any Minister with deniall of the Oath of Supremacie, as the Defender (perhaps) most leasngly suggests, without particular instance of time or person. And touching the Sentences, they are euer conceived in generall termes, with relation to the proceffe, wherein are contained the particular crimes,

crimes, *In sententia definitiva regulariter non requiritur expressio Cause*, saith *Casus Contrarius*, in *l. Vnicam. Cod. Si de momentaneis poss. fuerit appellatum. pag. 110. Vide ff. de appell. l. 2.*

Ans. to the
3. Grievance.

To the 3. The equitie of the proceedings, dependeth vpon the reasons alleadged in the Answer to the first Grievance. Seeing the partie depriued is dead in Law, his appellation being void and of no effect, as is aforesaid, the Ordinarie is bound to giue intimation, and notice vnto the Patron of the auoydance of the Church, whereupon he instituteth a new Clerke, being presented vnto him, whom if any shall resist, it is the ordinarie course of Law he should be remoued, by the writ *de vi laica remouenda*: which writ the reuerend and sage Iudges of the Common Law would neuer grant, except it were liable in such a case. And if this course be to be held IN VIRIORS, then certainly, not the Ecclesiasticall proceedings, but the Common Law is to be blamed, for both the *Intimation*, and the *Writte de vi laica remouenda* are Common Law,

Ans. to the
4. Grievance.

To the 4. The fact is particular, if it be true. Neither are the Registers and Notaries vpon their oath, to deliuer copies of the Acts made before them; but only to write the same truely, without falsification, corruption or forgerie: albeit the refusall of deliuering copies, their fees being tendered them, is otherwise punishable by the Canon.

Ans. to the
5. Grievance.

To the 5. I. The Ordinarie is the Archbishops Deputie, and exerciseth Ecclesiasticall Iurisdiction, as from and vnder the Archbishop. II. The Archbishop his inhibition, during the time of his Visitation, is *in mouendis, non motis*. III. If the Bishop should do any thing against the Archbishops inhibition, it followeth not, that therefore his act should bee void in Law, but his contempt were punishable, &c.

Ans. to the
6. Grievance.

To the 6. The Bishops grant vnto his Commissaries, Officials or Vicars generall, is no otherwise but *saluis iuribus Episcopalibus*: neither can the Bishop so resigne his iurisdiction vnto another, but that he may at his owne pleasure aduocate

Arg. 3. THE MILD DEFENCE. 155

advocate any cause vnto himselfe. No Comisarie or Official can depriue a man, for *Eius est destituere, cuius est instituere.*

To the 7. It is a flat vntruth, and a meere *Audacia.*

Answ. to the

To the 8. I. The question is not of the nullitie of the act, but whether the Bishop did obserue *decorum*, for simplic the Ordinarie may *ius dicere* in any part of his iurisdiction.

7. Grievance.

Answ. to the

8. Grievance.

II. The parties consented to the place. III. The fact is particular.

To the 9. Processe made *ex mero Officio*, is made by IN-
QUISITION, according vnto the letter and meaning of the Statute: for the Bishop may lawfully inquire *ex Officio*.

Answ. to the

9. Grievance.

Lyndwood saith, *Sine scandalum, sine periculum, sine suspicio gravis sine contra aliquem, Prælati sunt potest procedere ad inquisitionem, vel si non inueniant probationes indicet purgationem &c.* *Lynd. Constitut. Provinc. lib. 5. cap. 1. §. Compellant. in Gloss.*

To the 10. The fact, if it be true, is particular, and needeth no farther answer.

Answ. to the 10.

Grievance.

II.

In the meane time I would propound two or three Questions vnto the Suppliants, wherein I would craue their resolution and direct answer.

I. *Quære.* Whether the Church vnder Christian godly Magistrates, hath any Tribunal proper vnto it self, for deciding of Controversies, and punishing of such persons, as shall refuse the ordinances thereof?

3. *Quæres* proposed to the refractarie Ministers.

II. *Quære.* Whether so many iudiciall Acts of deprivation of Bishops, Priests, Ministers, from their Benefices &c. since the Conquest to the time of *Magna Charta*, and thence that to this age, were euer held to be contrary to the Lawes of this Kingdome, and *Magna Charta*?

Y

III. *Quære.*

III. *Quære.* Whether any Iudge of this Realme, or any chiefe officer learned in the Lawes, be of opinion, that such Sentences of deprivation, as haue lately passed in due forme, in any Ecclesiasticall Court, be contrarie to any, much lesse to many Statutes?

At these 3. *Quæres*, the Defender standeth so astonished and amazed, as if they were so many heads of *Medusa*. And knowing not whither to wind & turne himself, lest he might seeme to be altogether mute (as indeed he is for any thing he answereth to the purpose) he so inuolues himselfe, in such intricate Labyrinths of obscuritie, that any man may easily perceiue, he labourerth of purpose to decline the questions, babling he knoweth not what, suspecting euery word, as if he feared a Scorpion vnder euery stone. To the first *Quære* he answereth.

Reply.

Vnto this Quære, When he shall distinguish, and make his so many Equiuocations (contained in the Quære) perspicuous and plaine, to the vnderstanding of euery simple and plaine meaning man, I shall (God willing) make him a simple, plaine, resolute and direct answere. In the meane time, let him vnderstand, first that we iustly doubt, what he meaneth by the Word Church; and namely, whether he meaneth the Vniuersall Church, or a Nationall, a Proninciall, a Diocesan, an Archidiaconall, a Decanall, a Capitular, or lastly a Parochiall Church. For all men (as we vsually and commonly we speake) doe vnderstand, that euery of these Churches, hath her proper name, after which shee is called: as namely the Church dispersed throughout the world, is called the Vniuersall Church, the Church within England, is commonly called the Nationall Church of England; the Church within the Prouince of Canterburie, the Proninciall Church of Canterburie, the Church of the Diocesse of London, the Diocesan Church of London &c. And lastly the Church of great St. Ellens in London, the Parochiall Church of St. Ellens in London. And therefore I craue a resolute and direct answere, of what only persons you meane, that the Vniuersall, this Nationall,

Arg. 8. THE MILD DEFENCE. 157

Nationall, Prouinciall, Diocesan, Archidiaconall, Decanall, Capitular, and Parochiall Church consisteth? Who only be the Christian godly Magistrates, vnder whom euery one of these Churches smeth? Whether the same Christian godly Magistrates may personally be present, giue their expresse consents, and haue their decisive voices, to and in making all and euery decrees of euery of these Churches? What is the Tribunall proper to it selfe, of euery of these Churches? What only manner of Controuersies, by euery of these Churches may be decided? What only kind of circumstances, euery of these Churches may decree? What only kind of subiect, and with what only kind of punishment, and none other, euery of these Churches may punish the refusers of euery their ordinances?

Our second maine scruple, touching this first Quære, ariseth from these words (vnder Christian godly Magistrates.) For if by these words &c.

Vanius loquax, saith St. *Augustine*; and the Defender Reioynder. so behaueth himselfe in this kind, as if he were some foole in a play. But that he may pretend no farther excuses, I answer, By the word CHURCH, I meane euery Church that hath power to make and ordaine Lawes, as namely the *Vniuersall Militant*, in a generall Councell; a *Nationall Church* in a nationall Synode; and a *Prouinciall Church* in a prouinciall Synode; the *Diocesan* and *Parochiall Churches* haue only power to celebrate Synodes and meetings, for execution of the Decrees already made, not to ordaine new Lawes. What the Defender meaneth by *Archidiaconall, Decanall and Capitular Churches*, I know not, but would faine learne of him, it should seeme he is ignorant, that the *Deane* and *Chapter*, and the *Archdeacon*, are as it were the eyes and hands of the Bishop in the government of the Diocesse, for the better execution and practise of the ordinances and decrees of the Vniuersall, Nationall, and Prouinciall Synods, and do not constitute any particular Churches different from the Diocesan. By CHRISTIAN GODLY MAGISTRATES, I meane the King in a Monarchie, and others principall States in any other government,

NW.

ment, who are the Keepers of both Tables. As touching that Question, *Whether the Magistrate may personally be present, give his expresse consent, and have a decisive voice, to and in the making of all the Decrees of the Church;* albeit it be impertinent for the satisfying of my *Quære*, yet as I do not deny this, if the Magistrate be so pleased, so I craue the Defenders resolution, and direct answer vnto this same question: for they of his faction are thought, so to commit the care of these things vnto their *Presbyteris*, vnto whom they subalternate, yea subiect the Ciuill Gouvernours, that they vtterly exclude the Christian Magistrate, and giue him no more power in Church matters; then if he were an heathen or Infidell, as indeed the Defender seemeth not obscurely to insinuate in the later end of this very paragraph. Concerning the rest of his interrogatories; The *TRIBVNALL* proper vnto the Church, are the Councils and Synods of the same. The *CONTROVERSIES* there to be handled, are such as be of Ecclesiasticall cognisance. The *ORDINANCES* there to be made, are such as are declarations of the circumstances necessarie, or profitable for keeping of the first table of the Decalogue. The *SUBIECT*, are such as haue given their names to the Church, and vowed obedience. And the *PUNISHMENT*, is admonition, suspension, sequestration, excommunication, deprivation, or such as the qualitie of the crime deserueth, and is by Law in that case provided. To the Defenders tautologic, concerning the supposed equiuocation in the words (*Vnder Christian godly Magistrates*) I haue answered already.

Reply.

To the 2. *Quære*, he answereth: *To dance after your Pipe, (I will not say, what a foolish and ridiculous Question, but) what an odde tune is this? For can a man dance after a pipe, before the pipe be striken vp? So could acts done before Magna Charta, and other Lawes since made, be said to be contrary to them; This is as much, as one should aske? Whether Adam, not Circumcising Caine and Abel, did contrary to the Law giuen for Circumcision to Abraham many yeeres after? Or whether Ishmael persecuted Isaac, before Isaac was borne? Or whe-*

ther

Arg. 3. THE MILD DEFENCE. 159

her stealing of horses an hundredth yeeres past, were punishable with death, before any Law made for death in that behalf? One thing cannot be said contrary to another, that is not, neither was extant in rerum natura.

Grosse and palpable Rupiditie ! Where is the Defenders witte and reason? Are not the Words [*Laws of this Kingdom*] in this second *Quere*, to be referred to such acts of deprivation, as were made since the Conquest, to the time of *Magna Charta*? And the words [*Magna Charta*] to be referred to those acts, that were made since the time of the great Charter, to this day? But this fillic fellow, to couer his manifest tergiversation, will not vnderstand plaine English!

To the 3. *Quere*, he saith, *Though it were a sufficient answer to bid him go looke, and himseife to take the opinion of every Iudge and learned Officer, yet will I not altogether yeeld him so short and cuttied an answer. And though it be a principle in Philosophie, that Forma dat esse rei, yet to the being of every thing, there must be matter, so which the forme giueth being. And therefore in this case, besides due forme, there must be also due matter, inserted in due sentences. Wherefore I craue a resolute and direct answer, whether by those words (passed in due forme) he means passed for matter & forme, in due forme? Or whether he meane, passed without due matter in due forme only?*

To omit the Defenders Philosophie concerning *Matter* and *Forme*, and to vse his owne words; I answer resolutely and directly, that by the words [*passed in due forme*] I meane as the Defender saith, *passed for matter and forme, in due forme*; neither am I ignorant, that all the Iudges and learned Officers in the Law, do approue those Sentences of deprivation, so giuen in the Ecclesiasticall Courts, which causeth me the more to maruel at the impudencie and presumption of the refractarie faction, that contradict all the Iudges, and traduce all such Sentences, as vniust, vnlawfull, &c.

That which followeth, concerning the *Statute of Mag-*

Deprivation
for non con-
formitie gran-
ted lawfull by
the Defender.

na Charta, and the lawfulness of the Deprivation of the re-
fractarie Ministers for not conforming themselves &c. re-
quireth no farther answer: seeing the Defender himselfe
(*pag. 93.*) confesseth such deprivation to be iust, and accord-
ing to Law, saying: *Hereupon WE GRANT, that if the*
King have any Ecclesiasticall Law of the Land (which thing
was neuer doubted by any man) *for the DEPRIVATION*
of a Minister from his libertie and freehold, for not subscrip-
tion, perjurie, contempt of Canonick (so called) obedience, omis-
sion of rites and cceremonies, not precise obseruation of the booke
of Common Prayer &c. then WE GRANT, that the Ordina-
ries (being the Kings Iudges Ecclesiasticall) MAY RIGHT-
LY DEPRIVE A MINISTER FROM HIS BENEFICE
for these offences.

Yet I can but wonder at the giddines of the Defenders
Spirit, where he seemeth expressly to deny what heere he
confesseth. *Notwithstanding* (saith he) *I affirme that all Iu-*
dicicall acts and Sentences (how many former of deprivation of
Ministers, from their Benefices) had, made and given, by the
Ecclesiasticall Iudges, since the 25. of King Henry the 8. only
according, or only by force, and vertue of the said Ius Pontifi-
cium, or Bishop of Rome his Law, (the Sentences given in the
time of Queene Mary excepted) are, and ought to be holden,
not to be had, made and given, by the Lawes of this Kingdome,
or by the Kings Ecclesiasticall Law. And why? Even because
the whole Ius Pontificium, or Bishop of Romes Law was altoge-
ther (excepting the time of Queene Mary) abrogated, annul-
led, and made void, by an Act of Parliament; and consequen-
tly is but a meere Alien, Forraine and Strange Law, and no mu-
nicipall Law of England, and therefore not the Kings Ecclesi-
asticall Law.

I answer, I. The Defender had been a good Annuocate
for bloodie BOKER and other Popish Prelats, that were
deprived in the daies of that renowned Prince, King EN-
VWARD the VI. and also in the beginning of the raigne of
our late noble Queene: for all the Lawiers in England were
not then able to espie, what now the Defender plainly
seeth,

Arg. 8. THE MILD DEFENCE. 161.

seeth, except his eyes deceive him: II. The Deprivation of the refractarie Ministers, for non-conformitie is grounded, not vpon the *Canon Law*, but vpon the expresse words of the Statute (of 1. *Eliz. cap. 2.*) All and singular Archbishops and Bishops &c. shall haue full power and auctoritie by vertue of this Act &c. to punish by admonition, excommunication, sequestration, or DEPRIVATION, &c.

III. It is not true that the *Canon Law* was euer yet, or is How farre the now altogether abrogated, annulled, and made void by Act of *CANON LAW* Parliament, and so consequently it is not a *meere Alien*, is abrogated.

Forraine and Strange Law, but is the Law of the Land, yea and the Kings Ecclesiasticall Law: as is manifest by the very words of the Statute, which the Defender would haue pointed at, (25. *H. 8. cap. 19. in fine.*) Provided also, that such Canons, Constitutions, Ordinances and Synodals prouinciall, being already made, which be not contrariant, nor repugnant to the Lawes, Statutes and customes of this Realme, nor to the damage or hurt of the Kings prerogatiue Royall, SHALL NOWV STILL BE VSED AND EXECVTED, as they were afore the making of this Act. And in the 21. Chapter more plainely, (25. *H. 8. cap. 21. non longe à princip.*) Where this your Graces Realme recognising no Superiour vnder God, but only your Grace, hath bin & is free from all subiection to any mans Lawes, but only to such as haue been deuised, made and ordained within this Realme, for the wealth of the same, or TO SUCH OTHER, as by sufferance of your Grace, and your Progenitors, the people of this your Realme, haue taken at their free libertie, by their owne consent to be vsed amongst them, and haue bound themselues by long vse and custome, to the obseruance of the same, not as to the ordinance of the Lawes of any forraine Prince, Potentate or Prelate, but as to the CUSTOMED AND ANCIENT LAWES OF THIS REALME, originally established as
LAWES OF THE SAME, by the said sufferance, consents and custome, and none otherwise. It standeth therefore with naturall equitie and good reason; that all and e-

NW.

NW.

“very such Lawes humane, made within this Realme, or introduced into this Realme by the said sufferance, consents and custome, your royall Maieitie, &c. Thus farre the words of the Statute. Both which Acts being repealed by Queene *Mary*, were reuiued againe by Queene *Elizabeth* (1. *Eliz. cap. 1. in princip.*) and so stand in force at this day.

The Defenders long and tedious Digressions, touching the *Oath ex Officio* (a point learnedly handled by *M. Doctor Cofens*, in his Apologie, whereunto I referre the Reader) and also concerning the *Canons*, it were to wearisome vnto the Reader here to refute; Neither haue I such leasure to follow him in his idle and adle discourses; but haue determined precisely, to keepe my selfe within the bounds prescribed by the Suppliants. *Linguo coarx raris, &c.*

IX. ARGUMENT.

Supplicat.

God doth euer plentifully recompense any kindnes shewed vnto his Children, specially vnto the Ministers and disciples of Christ.

Ergo, The high Court of Parliament ought to shew kindnes vnto the refractarie ministers.

ANSWERE.

To the Consequence.

I

Answer.

OVR Sauour saith, *He that receiueth a Prophet, in the name of a Prophet, shall receive a Prophets reward, (Matth. 10. 41.)* So shall he also that doth any kindnes vnto a Minister. But if a Minister do otherwise

Arg. 9. THE MILD DEFENCE. 163

wise then he ought (as these Refractories do) what kindnes then ought such to haue done vnto them?

The Defender replieth two things. *I. There is a secret Reply. contradiction in this Answer, for as a Maior out of his Office is no Maior, so a Minister out of his Ministerie is no Minister.*

Was there euer heard such a Proposition vttered by any Reioynder. Divine! *A Minister out of his Ministerie is no Minister!* An absurd Position of the Defender. Then belike as oft as a Minister is silenced, or suspended, or depriued, if he shall be restored againe, or called into some other place, hee must haue a new ordination. Vpossible and absurd. Neither can the Office of a Maior, being but temporary, for a yeere only, be compared vnto the Office of a Minister, being perpetuall. The Error, is *ἡ ἀλλοτρίωσις τῆς ἐκκλησίας* in Theologia: Also, *ἡ ἀλλοτρίωσις τοῦ μὴ ἐκ τοῦ ὅπου ἐστὶν ὁ δόξαν.*

II. What a multitude of conformable Ministers are quite overthrowne by this Argument? For do not many of them otherwise then they ought?

But what aduantage hath this the refractarie Ministers? We do not affirme that such as doe otherwise then they ought, whether conformable, or refractarie, ought to receiue any fauour in that respect. The Error, is *ἡ ἀλλοτρίωσις*.

II.

Let the refractarie Ministers dutifully serue God and his Church, in their diligent and humble obedience, in the worke of their vocation, and then let them supplicate for kindnesse to be shewed vnto them.

The Defender replies. *What is that diligent and humble obedience? To put on a Surplice, to make a wishing Crosse, to reade Service, to acknowledge the Prelats to haue power to make ordinances against Gods word, &c? How shall they supplicate? With a 100. or 200. in a bagge? Then perhaps if they arise betimes, and ride a pafe, they shall haue a paire of benefices, an Archdeaconrie, &c. yea libertie a' foot to go whither they will, and neuer to come at any of their benefices.*

Reioynder.

This scorning and lying Spirit needeth no other re-
 prooffe, but *The Lord rebukes thee, Satban.*

X. ARGVMENT.

Supplicat.

God threatneth feuerely to punish the
 wrongs and iniuries done vnto his
 Children and Seruants, euen in their
 outward state much more the cruel-
 tie towards their Soules.

Ergo, The high Court of Parliament
 should neither proceed so hardly a-
 gainst the Ministers, nor winke at o-
 thers that do so proceed.

ANSVVER.

To the Consequence.

I.

Answer.

Neither did the honorable Court of Parliamēt,
 nor the Magistrates of this Land, euer intend
 the least wrong to any Subiect in this Kingdome,
 much lesse to any *Minister of the Gospell*, no not in
 their outward estate, much lesse towards the *salua-
 tion of their soules*. And certainly it is an vngratefull,
 yea an vngracious part of these Suppliants, to taxe
 that honorable Assemblie, or any Magistrate of this
 Land, so vndutifully and vnchristianly, for vniust,
 cruell and mercilesse dealing.

Reply and

Reioynder.

The Defender 1. Denieth that any of his faction, euer
 taxed either the house of Parliament, or any Magistrate;
 but

Arg. 10. THE MILD DEFENCE. 165

but only *admonished them of those faults, which GOD forbideth*; as if vniust admonition and reprehension, were not presumptuous taxing of men. 2. Retorteth the argument vpon vs, affirming that we, not they, taxe the high Court of Parliament, all which needeth no farther answer. Let the discreet Reader conferre the *Supplication* and the *Milde Defence* together, and then iudge indifferently where the fault resideth.

II.

The refractarie Ministers were neuer proceeded Answer. against, for *preaching the Gospell*, or for opportune and sober executing their Ministeriall function: but only for giddie innouation and noueltie, for faction, schisme, and impugning the Magistrates auctoritie, for disturbing the peace and quietnesse of the Church. And would they request these vile enormities to bee left unpunished? An vnreasonable Suite.

The Defender replies. *This is utterly untrue. For some of Reply. vs haue been molested for preaching any thing tending against the present Hierarchie, or any other corruptions: some also for confuting the Popish doctrine of other, though they haue done it neuer so soberly: and some for other matters, which are points of the Gospell, as well as other.*

Preaching against the present state and government of the Church, is not preaching the Gospell. Preaching against corruptions, or sober confuting Popish doctrine, was neuer no cause of the refractarie Ministers trouble. By those OTHER MATTERS he speaketh of, he meaneth the pretended DISCIPLINE, which euery man knoweth is no point of the Gospell. Heere is nothing but a meere contradiction of what I say. It should seeme the Defender growes very barren.

XI. ARGVMENT.

Supplicat.

Pharaoh provided for the Idolatrous Priests of *Ægypt*. And the Monkes and Friars at the dissolution of their idolatrous Houses, were provided for during their liues, though they neuer had done any good.

Ergo, Much more ought the refractarie Ministers to be provided for, hauing done so great good in the Church of God.

ANSVVERE.

To the Consequence.

Answer.

THe argument doth not follow, because of the dissimilitude that is in the instances or examples alleadged, and the Ministers case.

Reply.

The Defender replies. *The Argument doth follow the better, because of the dissimilitude of instances.*

Reioynder.

This will appeare otherwise, in examination of the particulars.

I.

Answer.

Pharaoh ministered daily food vnto such Priests, whom he thought professed true Religion, and diligently obeyed him in the function of their Office. A rare example of a bountifull and magnificent Prince, though otherwise in error. But the refractarie Ministers, though professing true Religion, yet do they obstinately, being blinded by superstition, refuse

Arg. 11. THE MILD DEFENCE. 167

refuse to serue God and his Church, in the faithful and diligent function and exercise of their Ministerie.

The Defenders replie is. 1. *As Pharaoh was in error touching the religion and obedience of his Priests, so are our Prelats, touching our refractarines and Superstition.*

Not so. Pharaoh was indeede deceiued, and in error: but our Prelats are not; neither touching the Ministers Refractarines, as daily experience testifieth; nor touching their Superstition, seeing they accompt that sinne, which is no sinne.

2. *Our obedience towards his Maiestie is as good, as of the best of their side. That mans obedience to a Mayor of a towne, or to any other inferiour Office of a Prince, is alwaies the best, that is most agreeable to the pleasure of the Prince himselfe. In like manner, that obedience is best vnto Princes, that doth best agree with the pleasure of the Prince of Princes, and King of Kings. To obey the Inferiour, without due regard of the Superiours pleasure, is but flatterie and fawning, not good obedience. So to obey Princes, without due regard to our dutie to God. For it is more preiudiciall and hurtfull, then beneficiall and profitable to such Princes.*

Well. Your obedience to his Maiestie is good. You say so. But your deeds proue the contrarie: for you daily kicke against his Maiesties auctoritie, and will not be reduced to obedience. Neither is there any thing here spoken, but the Papists will say as much for themselves. You limite how farre you are to be obedient vnto the King: so do the Papists; for neither of you will serue God, vnder his Maiesties government, according vnto the Religion established. You say you are as dutifull and obedient, as any of our side: so will the Papists pronounce of themselves, if they might be their owne iudges. But in the meane time, the Defender doth not iustifie Pharaohs example rightly alleaded, to procure compassion towards the refractarie Ministers. Let vs come to the next instance.

II.

Answer. The *Monkes* and *Friers* were deprived of all, against their will, for Sodomie, Heresie, and Idolatry, which they had embraced in time of their ignorance. But the refractarie Ministers are willingly deprived, for obstinate superstition, in refusing sincerely to preach the Gospell of Christ with vs, not being conformable vnto the Christian Lawes of our Church and Magistrates.

Reply. The Defender replies. *The more iustly that Monkes and Friers were put out, the stronger is the argument for vs, to be provided for, that are put out vniustly.*

Reioynder. It is true, if you were VNIVSALLY put out: but in saying so, you beg the Question; proue it, if you can.

III.

Answer. The *Monkes* and *Friers* could not haue retained their places and possessions, no not by submitting themselves: But the refractarie Ministers may, if they will but conforme themselves vnto the lawful Ordinances of our Church.

Reply. The Defender replies. *I know no condition of submission offered to Monkes &c. Touching the rest, we thanke you for nothing. This is the curtesie of the Prelats, to make vs pay deare for our liuings, euen to buy them with sinning against God.*

Reioynder. What needed there be any condition of submission offered to *Monkes*, when they could not haue kept their places by any submission they could make? For the rest, you shew your desperate resolution, still to continue in your schisme and faction, and that vnder such a pretense, as will neuer stand before the tribunall seate of God to excuse you. The Lord soften your hard and stonie hearts. The Error in both the instances, is ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΟΝ ΤΟ ΜΑΙΝΕΣΘΑΙ, ος ΙΑΝΤΩΝ.

XII. ARGUMENT.

The Prayers of faithful Ministers of the *Supplicat.*
Gospel, are very effectuall in be-
halfe of Christian assemblies.

Ergo, The high Court of Parliament, e-
uen for this cause, ought somewhat
to regard the refractarie Ministers.

ANSWER.

To the Consequence.

I.

Neither are the Prayers of Schismatiques much Answer-
to be regarded : neither will the honorable
Court of Parliament altogether neglect the refrac-
tarie Ministers, but will labour by all good meanes
for their recalling : neither can the refractarie Mi-
nisters in Charitie, but stil pray for that high Court,
yea in case they did not satisfie their desire.

The Defender replies. *As for the Prayers of Schisma- Reply.*
tiques, it is not much to be denied, if men be schismatiques in
deed, and not only in name : but neither the Answerer, nor all
the Prelats in the world, shall ever prone vt Schismatiques and
Refractaries, as they uniuersally tearme vs.

That the refractarie Ministers are PVRE SCHISMA- Reioyndera
TIQUES, hath been abundantly proued before (in the Re-
ioynd. to the Defence of the 3. Arg. pag. 116. & seqq.) I will
not adde a word more vntill that be answered. Only I de-
sire I may not be mistaken in this point, to wit, that the
Prayers of Schismatiques, are not much to be regarded, I
meane, as they are SVCH ; other wise the Prayers of Gods
Saints

170 A REIOYNDER TO *Arg. 13.*
Saints are very behouuefull and necessary for vs.

II.

Answer. If they had still made conscience of their dutie in their Ministerie, their *Prayers* had been much more effectuell.

Reply. The Defender replies. *Behold what conscience these men make of Subscription, Crosse, Surplice, Conformitie, and other particular obedience; that make no conscience of preaching &c. Is it not strange also, that Surplice and crosse should add such efficacie to prayer?*

Reioynder. It is true, we make *conscience of obedience*. Do they of the Defenders faction, make no conscience thereof? But that we make no conscience of *Preaching &c.* also, that *Crosse, Surplice, &c.* adde any efficacie to prayer, is a palpable vntruth. The Error is *diabolica*.

XIII. ARGVMENT.

Supplicat. Our Sauour willeth al to pray the Lord of the haruest, that he would thrust forth labourers into his haruest.

Ergo, No man ought by head and shoul-
ders to thrust labourers out of the har-
uest.

ANSWER.

I.

Answer. I Grant the whole. If the Suppliants will insist, *Why then do you silence and deprive the Ministers?*

II.

I answer. They are nor such Labourers, whom our Sauour meaneth: neither are they thrust forth
of

Arg. 14. THE MILD DEFENCE. 171
of the haruest, for labouring, but for labouring as they ought not, for sowing the tares of sedition, Schisme and faction, for disturbing the peace of the Church, and for molesting other sincere and faithfull Labourers.

The Defender replies. *Touching the sowing of the tares Reply. of sedition, schisme, faction, and disturbing of the peace, hath bin often answered. All which doe rather belong to them that teach that a true iustifying faith may be lost, that there is no certentie of Salvation, that pleade for ignorance and an ignorant Ministerie, and such other like things.*

When the Defender hath nothing to say for the refractarie faction, then hee falles a rayling, or to slander our Church: for what other thing doth hee, seeing wee are so farre from defending any of these blasphemies he speaks of, as any man of their side. The Error is perpetua *Ans. 14.*

XIV. ARGUMENT.

Euery man ought freely to confesse *Supplicat.*
Christ before men, in the time aswel
of triall and persecution, as of truce
and peace.

Ergo, The high Court of Parliament
ought earnestly to speake for Christ
and his Word.

ANSWER.

I Grant the whole againe. What can this aduantage the refractarie Ministers? It followeth not, that therfore their Honors should speake for them. For they are neither *Christ*, nor his *Word*: neither

Answer.

A a

is

172 A REIOYNDER TO *Arg. 11.*
is their quarrell and contention, either for *Christ*, or
for his *Word*, as hath been declared before.

Reply.

The Defender replies. *They that strine against humane Ceremonies in Gods worship, and for the ordinances onely of Christ Iesus, doe strine also for Christ and his Word.*

But the Ordinances which the refractarie Ministers contend for, are not the *ordinances of Christ Iesus*: neither doe they strue for *Christ*, or for his *Word*, but for the supposed Senate of Lay-Aldermen, and their owne fantastique conceits. The Error is *ἡ ἀληθὴς πίστις τοῦ αὐτοῦ λαοῦ καταστρέφεται.*

XV. ARGVMENT.

Supplicat.

It is necessarie that there bee prouision made of sufficient able Ministers, one in euery Congregation, to instruct the people in the truth, to confute the Papists &c.

Ergo, The refractarie Ministers must needs be restored.

ANSVVERE.

I

Answered.

AS if there were not able Ministers inough (God be praised) in both the Vniuersities, and other parts of this Kingdome (if competent maintenance could be procured for them) sufficiently to furnish euery Congregation, to instruct the people in religion, to refute the Aduersarie &c. but that the small handfull of Schismaticall Ministers must needs be entreated to make vp the number.

Reply.

The Replie vnto vnto this Answer, consisting of meere tautologies,

Arg.^{ts}. THE MILD DEFENCE. 173
tautologies, contradictions of what I say, scoffes and bitter
slanders against our Church and Ministerie, deserueth no Reioynder.
other Reioynder, but *Thou liest, Satan.*

II.

Answer.

Suppose there were notable Ministers inough,
for this purpose : haue not the Refractories then
greater reason, to ioyne with thei Brethren, in prea-
ching the Gospell, confuting the Papists &c. then
superstitiously to quarrell about Crosse and Sur-
plice, and to forsake their necessarie vocation and
function?

Reply.

The Defender replieth. *Nay, haue not the Prelats the more
reason, to suffer vs still in the worke of the Ministerie with
them? We are all willing, so farre to ioyne with any in preaching
the Gospell, as we may doe nothing against the Gospell, to craze
the peace of our owne conscience.*

Reioynder.

Haue the reuerend and wise Prelats any reason, to ad-
mit such to labour in the Ministerie; who they know will
disturbe the peace of the Church? yea who plainly professe
that they will neuer bee conformable vnto the Discipline
established? None at all. Especially seeing the superiour
Magistrate hath reposed such trust in their fidelitie and di-
ligence, that they would carefully, to their vtmost abilitie,
endeuour to preserue pure Religion and vnitie among his
subiects. If the Refractory Ministers were permitted to la-
bour amongst vs; why then, their Consciences (forsooth)
would not suffer them to performe, either faithfull seruice
vnto their Brethren, or loyall obedience to his Maiestie.
Better it is for the Church of God, that such Ministers, and
such Consciences should haue no part in our societie, than
that all States should be set together by the eares about
idle and needlesse questions.

XVI. ARGUMENT.

Supplicat.

The Matters in question, viz. Subscription, Ceremonies, the strict obseruation of the Book, and other Conformatie, are not of any necessarie vse, but are causes of diuision, and bones of contention amongst vs.

Ergo, They both conueniently may, and ought to be taken away.

ANSWERE.

To the Antecedent.

I.

Answer.

IF the matters in question betweene vs, bee but *Subscription, Ceremonies &c.* as here the Suppliāts ingenuously confesse; wherefore haue they hitherto mainly cried out, that their contention was about the CAUSE OF GOD, and his WORD, WHOLE CHRIST and his GOSPELL, the MINISTERIE thereof, and SALVATION of the people?

Reply.

The Defender replieth. *The least transgression of Gods Word, and the least obedience to Gods Word, is the Cause of God, as well as the greatest.*

Reioynder.

But the Defender ought first to haue proued, that wilfull contemning and kicking against the gouernment and rites established in our Church, is OBEDIENCE TO GODS WORD: also, that dutifull and peaceable conformatie, and exercising of the said ceremonies and rites established,

is

Arg. 16. THE MILD DEFENCE. 175

is TRANSGRESSION OF GODS WORD; and then he had said somewhat. But that will neither the Defender, nor all the packe of the faction, be neuer able to do.

II.

Albeit we also do not hold *Subscription, Ceremo-* Answer.
nies &c. to be absolutely necessarie to saluation, nor to be imposed vpon euery Church (for why should not other Churches vse their owne libertie?) yea and our Church also hath power to alter these particulars: yet we know that some Ordinances and Ceremonies, are necessary for gathering of assemblies, establishing of a Church, and to be as it were the bonds and lincks of societie.

The Defender replies. *How doth the first point of this Answer agree with that, that some of the great Prelats hold, that their auctoritie is Apostolicall, and the Ceremonies matters of order and decencie? Are not things Apostolicall and decent, common to all Churches? Or may our Church alter that, that is Apostolicall? Or why should these Ceremonies, be more necessarie for our Church, then for other Churches? Or not decent for other Churches, and yet decent for ours?*

I answer particularly. 1. There is no contrarietie betwene what I writ, and what the Defender saith others of our side do hold: for the calling of Bishops is *Apostolicall*, who denies it? 2. The Ceremonies we vse are matters of order and decency. 3. There are many things both *Apostolicall* and decent, which all Churches at all times are not bound vnto. 4. The particular occasions, and circumstances of our Church may be such, that some things may be decent vnto vs, which are not so for other Churches. All which are perspicuously laid downe and proved by instances and examples in my *Book called Admonition*, which here need not be repeated, vnto which I referre the Reader.

III.

Yea euen these particulars, *Subscription, Ceremo-* Answer.

nies &c. being imposed by the Church, and commanded by the Magistrate, are necessary to be observed vnder paine of sinne, seeing he that resisteth auctoritie, resisteth the ordinance of God. Rom. 13.

Reply.

The Defender replies. *What if they be commanded only by the Christian Magistrate, not imposed by the Church? Or imposed by the Church only, the Magistrate being an Infidell, or a persecutor of the Church? Can paine of sinne also be without paine of damnation? Are not those things that are to be obeyed vnder paine of damnation, necessarie to saluation? Hence also it followeth, that things once commanded by the Church or Magistrate (especially by both) are as holy, as the immediate Commandements of God. The particular inconueniences and absurdities hereof are infinite. What also is heere said, that was not wont to be said by the Papiſts against the Martyrs?*

Reioynder.

The Magistrate cannot impose any thing vpon the Church, without the consent thereof: but the Church may impose any indifferent ordinance vpon it selfe, without the consent of the Magistrate, if the Magistrate be an *Infidell*, or a *Persecutor*; which cannot be wilfully transgressed, vnder the penaltie of Sinne, and so consequently of damnation, without repentance for it. Yet it followeth not, that such Decrees are as *H O L Y*, as the Ordinances of God, the reason hereof is apparant in my booke *De Adiaphoris*. The Popish ordinances and rites are not things indifferent, or lawfull in themſelues; ours are. The Error is, *ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΟΝ ΜΗΔΕΝ ΤΙΝΙ ΕΠΙΟΡΙΣΜΟΝ, ΗΙΕ ΕΠΙΟΡΙΣΜΟΝ.*

IV.

Answer.

And that they are things *Indifferent* in themſelues, and may bee vsed without sinne, wee haue proued at large, in a peculiar Booke written of that Argument. *Lib. de Adiaphoris.*

Reply.

The Defender replies. *Alas M. Powel, make not such account of your Booke de Adiaphoris, then which, there neuer came more simple stiffe from any man reputed learned. You*
bad

Arg. 16. THE MILD DEFENCE. 177

had neede recant your blasphemous point therein, against the authoritie of Christ Iesus for making lawes in his Church. Varily you might as well haue denied him to be a King, and a Redeemer.

As by writing that Booke DE ADIAPHORIS (a work Reioynder. not voluntarily vndertaken by my selfe, but imposed by Authoritie) I neuer regarded to please Man, at whose hands I looke not for my reward; but laboured to serue the necessitie of Church, vnto whose seruice I owe my selfe: So now being written and published abroad, I weigh not what any priuate Spirit, being ouerruled by inordinate passions of loue or hatred, will censure or account thereof, for friends will flatter, and aduersaries raile; but wholly referre it vnto the iudgement of the CHVRCH of God, at whose graue and iudicious sentence, I stand, or fall. And touching the generall doctrine of the Protestants, that CHRIST IS NO LAVVGIVER, which you in your deep ignorance terme BLASPHEMIE; object against it, & you shall (God willing) be answered. But you professe (*pag. 156.*) that you will leaue that Book to other to shew my childish weakenes therein. You doe very well; for by so doing you prouide the better for your owne credit: for that Book is written in Latin, & you cannot write true English.

V.

Now that they are become the *Bones of contenti- on, and Causes of diuision* among vs, is very much to be lamented, seeing the free course of the Gospell is somewhat troubled, and the common enimie advantaged thereby. But the fault rests on them, who of meere superstition and grosse ignorance, cannot find in their consciences to embrace the wholesome Ordinances and Constitutions of the Church, not any way preiudicall vnto the Gospell, nor repugnant vnto the Word of God, but most agreeable and consonant vnto the same.

The

Reply.

The Defender replies. *That these things are become bones of contention, is only the fault of the Prelates, that strive with might and maine for them. They acknowledge that they haue power to alier and remoue them, and they see great reason so to doe: neither can they giue any reasons but childish for continuance of them; and yet to the great dishonour of God, and to the grieffe of thousands of the godly, they retaine them.*

Reioynder.

It is not the fault, but the dutie of the Prelats, to labour to reduce Schismaticques and factious persons to vnitie and concord: neither doe they strive with might and maine for Ceremonies, but for the peace of the Church: neither can the Prelats, without direction from the Christian Magistrate, and the consent of the Church, alter or remoue the Ceremonies now vsed; neither if they could, were they, in policie, to institute any importune innouations, which would bee a speciall scandall to many, both within, and without the Church.

XVII. ARGVMENT.

Supplicat.

IN this Argument the Suppliants, *heaping* (as themselves professe) *many things together, and contriuing many Arguments into one,* do certainly very worthily and Christianly discourse, as of sundrie other things, so especially cōcerning the Lords great mercies, in the miraculous deliuerance, as of you honorable House of Parliament, so also consequētly of the whole State & Kingdome, thereby redeeming both our Bodies from corporall, and our Soules from spiri-
tuall

Arg. 17. THE MILD DEFENCE. 179
tuall intended captiuitie of that bloodie
Man of sinne, the child of Perdition. Which
verily should prouoke every good Chri-
stian, to speciall thankfulness vnto our hea-
uenly Father, to repentance for our former
transgressions, to present diligence in our
seuerall vocations, and euer hereafter to
keepe a more vigilant and watchfull eye,
ouer the perfidious & treacherous Aduer-
saries. But let vs examine, how the Suppli-
ants applie these things to their purpose.

BU before wee come to the particular examination of
the REASONS of this 17. Argument, the Defender
spieth something herein, which maketh much for them of
his faction.

*In these words (saith he) let the contrarietie of the An-
swerer, to almost in his whole Answer written, be observed.
For he being a Scholar, his words must be Scholently inter-
preted. Because therefore wee are not to doubt, but that the An-
swerer remembreth, as well what he hath learned in the E-
thiques, as in the Elenkes of Aristotle: may it please the Rea-
der to vnderstand, that Aristotle, in his said Ethiques, maketh
great difference betwixt Bonum and Bene, good and well; Iu-
stum and Iustè, iust and iustly. Good and iust things may be
done by euill and iniust men; but onely Good and iust man can
doe things Well and iustly. Because the Answerer therefore
doth here testifie, that the Suppliants discourse, not onely of ma-
ny Worthie and Christian points, but also Worthely and
Christianly: how can this agree with all the reprochfull termes
be giueth them, of Schismatiques, Refractaries, wilfull con-
tenders with the Magistrate, presumptuous censurers &c.*

Reioynder. But what maketh all this against me? or wherein doth it contrary any thing that I haue writtē? I haue euer thought, and doe at this present thinke (as charitie bindeth me) that many of the refractarie Ministers, are indeede *good Men* (though not as they are schismaticall) and *in grace and fauour with God*, as was said before (*in the 1. Arg. pag. 107.*) But may not GOOD MEN offend in some things? Is our regeneration perfect in this life? Doe not wee all a-misse in some things? Can any man say, he hath no sinne? What needed all this Defence therefore of a thing that was neuer denied?

I. REASON. *of the 17. Arg.*

Supplicat.

God sent lately amongst vs a mightie and feareful Pestilence, for the omission of some duty which should haue been performed.

Ergo, The high Court of Parliament is presently to restore the refractarie Ministers, specially seeing the plague doth still houer ouer our heads.

ANSVVERE.

Answer.

To let the Antecedent passe, which yet is not so fully and warily laid downe, as it ought to haue been. Who doth not see the weakenes of the Consequence? For doth God plague vs, because of the proceedings against the refractarie Ministers? and not rather for our horrible Sinnes of securitie, pride, vnthankfulness &c. This is certaine: and that rests to be proued still.

The

Arg. 17. THE MILD DEFENCE. 181

The Defender replies. *I haue told you of your mistaking Reply. Logike before. The Auctor disputeth not particularly of the sinnes that moued the Lord to visite vs; but of the generall end wherefore he did both correct vs, and also magnifie his mercie towards vs. The Which bee applied to the particular point of fauour for the Ministers molested. Notwithstanding, to answer your question, though it cannot be denied, that for other sinnes the Lord hath so heauily scourged vs, yet why should the suppressing of the Ministerie of the Gospell be excluded?*

Haue you told me of my mistaking *Logike*, who cannot tell (as appeareth by this alogicall Defence) what *Logike* meaneth, and are as fearfull of meeting a fallacie, as you are of a surie? All your clamour was raised only vpon the Correctors mistaking. The words in the written coppie (which yet is to bee shewed) are these. *They mistake the End; as those Gentiles did the Efficients, who affirmed they were plagued, because of the Christians contempt of their Gods.* You take all the aduantage you can, and allow vs no time to Answer your **LIBELS**. The Auctor divulged his *Supplication*, euen almost in the latter end of the last Session of Parliament, and I had not aboute foure or fise daies to write the *Consideration*; which I was compelled, through the straightnes of time, to commit vnto the presse, as fast as I could write it: wherefore I could not intend to correct it my selfe; which was the cause aswell of this error you exclaime against, as also of breaking the *Series* of the Alphabet, in the Marginall glosses of this 17. *Arg.* and of some other typographicall escapes. Neither haue I much more time allowed me to write this **RETOYNDER**, but am constrained (for lacke of time) to put part of it to the presse, before the whole can be finished. If I listed to take exception to what I thinke is the fault of the Printer in this your Booke, I might exclaime as much, and as iustly as you do; but I hold it no ingenuitie to catch at syllables and letters.

But to returne to your Replie. I say againe, that the **End** wherefore the Lord doth correct vs, is not the *Restoring* of

the refractarie Ministers; but rather he doth it, to recall vs from our finnes, of *securitie, vnbankesfulness, pride, &c.* The repressing of the Schismaticall Ministers (not the *Suppressing of the Ministerie of the Gospell*, as you speake) is excluded from that End; because it is no sinne to labour to recover them, and to reduce them to vnicie and obedience. The Erroris, *Ελαχιστον εν τω πυλινω εστιν αλλοιον*. The rest, which the Defender addeth, is true, not of such as he is, but of the faithfull Ministers of the Gospell.

II. REASON *of the 17. Arg.**Supplicat.*

God hath lately deliuered the House of Parliament, and the whole Land frō a bloodie intended Massacre.

Ergo, That honorable Court specially ought to testifie their thankfulness vnto God, by restoring the refractarie Ministers.

ANSVVER.

Answer.

AS if there were no other meanes, whereby that honorable Court might *testifie their thankfulness*, but by restoring Schismaticall Pastors vnto the Church, the more to disturbe the peace thereof.

Reply.

The Defender replies. *We denie not but that there are other meanes whereby that honourable Court may testifie their thankfulness: yet this bindeth not, but that this also may be one.*

Reioynder.

But the other meanes differeth from this *ex toto genere*. That other is the true exercise of pietie and charitie: this is horrible sinne, which would prouoke God the more to punish

Arg. 17. THE MILD DEFENCE. 183

punish vs. That which he addeth concerning *mercie* and *crueltie* towards *mens soules*, is meere sopperie, which hath been answered already.

III. REASON *of the 17. Arg.*

Many of the honorable Lords, and o-^{*Supplicat.*}ther members of the Parliament, are very ancient and stricken in yeeres: and therefore neuer againe like to be of any other Parliament.

Ergo, They ought to do good now, by restoring the Depriued and Silenced Ministers.

ANSWER.

BVt it hath not been yet proued, that to restore ^{*Answer.*} the refractarie Ministers, is to do Good, and not rather to do hurt, and to SINNE, by being cause of nourishing faction and dissention in the Church.

The Defender replieth NOTHING, but saith that this is *Answered already*. But where?

IV. REASON *of the 17. Arg.*

The refractary Ministers would be very ^{*Supplicat.*} glad, if they were comforted, restored and let alone.

Ergo, They ought so to be.

ANSVVER.

Answer. So would all Schismatiques, Heretiques, Papists, Atheists; yea all malefactors, murderers, theeves, cutpurfes, be very glad, if they were comforted, deliuered, and let alone.

Reply. The Defender replies: *In the bitterness of his Spirit, he reckoneth vs vp with all Schismatiques, Heretiques, Papists, murderers, theeves, cut-purfs.*

Reioynder. That my SPIRIT IS BITTER, such as haue any familiar acquaintance with me, know to bee the ERROR of your iudging and censuring Spirit, a fault too common vnto the men of your stampe. I doe not parallel you with *Heretiques, Papists, Atheists, murderers, theeves, cut-purfs*; onely I shew the absurditie of the Suppliants reason, seeing all these would bee as glad to bee let alone, as you would.

V. REASON. *of the 17. Arg.*

Supplicat.

The House of Parliament by their mercie shewed to the refractarie Ministers, shall not only treasure vp comfort vnto themselues against the day of their death, but shall also make their Old-age the more honorable, and their names memorable amongst all posteritie.

Ergo, They ought so to do.

ANSVVER.

ANSWERS.

I.

IF by *Mercy*, they meane their reclaiming from Answer.
Schisme and faction, I graunt the whole.

II.

But if they meane, their restoring againe, they
continuing still the same men they are now: then is
the Antecedent a foule Begging of the Question,
and the Argument inconsequent.

III.

For contrariwise it may bee concluded: The
House of Parliament, by Restoring Schismaticall
Ministers, to disquiet the peace of the Church, shall
not only attract guilt and remorse of conscience;
but also preiudice their honorable Age, and make
their names reproachfull amongst all posteritie.

The Defender replies, *Onely herein the Answerers con-
sure of the Parliament, if they should restore vs, is to be obser-
ued, viz. that they shall not onely attract guilt and remorse
of Conscience, but also preiudice their honourable Age,
and make their names reprochfull to all posteritie. This
toucheth not onely the Lords of the upper house, and body of the
Commons in the neiber house, but also his most excellent Ma-
iestie, without whose Princely auctoritie nothing can be done by
the other.*

I censure not the honourable Court of Parliament, nei- Reioynder.
ther the vpper, nor the lower House, much lesse doe I cen-
sure his Maiestie, because I know they will neuer RESTORE
SCHISMATIKES to disquiet the peace of the Church.
My words are plaine; I speake vpon supposition of doing
that, which (I assure my selfe) will neuer be done, to retort
the Supplians Reason vpon themselves. Is this censuring
the Parliament and King? No no, that trade is proper vnto
the

the Defenders faction, and vnto their catercozens or fellow-censurers, the Papists. This fellowes malice, seemes to exceede his learning.

VL REASON *of the 17. Arg.*

Supplicat.

As *Iſrael* was blessed aboue other w^omen dwelling in tents, for driving a nayle into *Siseraes* head: So should these Parliament men, bee blessed aboue many former, if they vterly took away all the Whoore of Romes Ornaments yet remaining &c.

Ergo, They ought to do so.

ANSWERE.

Answer.

THE instance is altogether different. For *Sisera* was a speciall enemy of the Children of *Iſrael*, and of the Church of God (*Iudg. 4. 2.*) But the Ornaments the Suppliants speake of, are the good creatures of God, hauing no hurt or ill in them.

Reply.

The Defender replies. *I. Was not Sisera also the creature of God, and in that respect may it not be said, that hee had no euill in him? And is not the Pope also an enemy to the people and Church of God, as well as Sisera was?*

Reioynder.

Sisera was indeede the creature of God, but an hurtfull enemy vnto the *Israelites*: the Ornaments wee speake of are creatures in like manner, but without hurt in them. *What* (saith the Defender) *is not the Pope also an enemy to the Church of God?* as if these Ornaments were the Pope.

Reply.

II. What doth the Answerer say for the Ornaments, that might not haue been said for Images?

Yes

Arg. 18. THE MILD DEFENCE. 187

Yes forsooth. Images are hurtfull; so are not the Ornaments. We are prohibited to MAKE Images: but not to USE the Ornaments. The Error is *Errat in re, non in nomine.*

II.

Neither were the Popish Idolatrous Priests euer Answered with our Ornaments; neither are they now.

III.

Neither were our Ornaments euer worshipped or abused to Idolatrie; neither are they yet.

IV.

Neither if they had bin, is it absolutely necessary to destroy the Substance of them, together with the abuse: but the abuse is to be abolished, and the true use restored. The reasons hereof, and cautions to be vsed in this point, I haue laid downe in another place. *Cap. 11. lib. de Adiaph.*

The Defender replies. I. *Are you sure, there is neuer a Reply. Surplice now in England, that was abused to Idolatrie publicly in Queene Maries time, or secretly sushens that time? If it be true of Surplices, are you sure it is true of all Coopes?*

I am not sure, I thinke so.

Reioynder.

II. *Haue you forgotten the distinction of Idem specie, and Idem numero?*

I remember it well: but this is, as if it were vnlawfull to vse gold in the Temple at Hierusalem, because Aaron framed his Idolatricall Calfe of gold.

III. *By this reason, we may cross with Images in the Church. Reply. chas. & say that these Images were neuer worshipped or abused.*

Nothing lesse: We are expressly forbidden to MAKE Reioynder. an Image, as hath bin noted before.

XIIIX. ARGUMENT.

The high Court of Parliament is bound *Supplicat.*

C c

specially

pecially to open their mouth for the dumbe, to iudge righteously, to iudge the afflicted and the poore, to giue strong wine to him that is ready to perish; and not to contemne the iudgement of the meanest Subiect.

Ergo, They are bound specially to restore the refractarie Ministers.

ANSWER.

I.

Answer.

THIS Argument is parallel, & the very same with the 8. Argument before, and is there answered.

II.

In one word. I grant the Antecedent, and deny the Consequence: because the refractarie Ministers are not such, as are specified in the Antecedent, as is often declared before.

Reply.

The Defender replies. *This is the Conclusion of all, which the Notarie and Answerer vnaptly call a distinct Argument. Neither is there any thing heere answered requiring replie, then hath been already made.*

Reioynder.

I haue followed the Auctor of the Supplication in numbering his Arguments, who in the beginning of this Argument or Conclusion (terme it what you will for me) *pag. 28. of the Supplication*, layeth downe this number [18.] and so goeth on with the Paragraph, as he had done in all the Arguments before, adding their proper number. And had not I reason to take it for a distinct Argument, being so laid downe by the Auctor? But let it be, as indeed all the rest are no Arguments, a goodly CONCLUSION forsooth, the Defender seeth nothing in the *Answer* worthy a *Reply*, nor I any thing in the *Reply* worthy a *Reioynder*.

THE

THE CONCLUSION.

AND thus haue I encountered with **IGNORANCE** it selfe, ioyned with extreame **MALICE**, passions wherewith the Defender seemeth to be notoriously qualified. First, his **IGNORANCE** is palpable, in that he hath neither **Arte** to dispute, nor **Stile** to discourse, nor Iudgemēt to discern such matters as he handleth: al which are euidently confirmed, I. By his immethodicall and euil-featured rhapsodie, being full of vaine tautologies, and farfed with much friuolous and idle talke, as it were of a disordered braine, lest his Booke (forsooth) might be termed a **TRILOBULAR PAMPHLET**, or a **TWVO-LEAVED LIBELL**, as himselfe seemeth to confesse (pag. 17.) II. By his senselesse Periods, and grosse Solecismes even in the English tongue: as (pag. 38.) *The Author is able to defend his meaning, or ready to yeeld better reason* TO THE CONTRARIE; also (pag. 46.) *The Cause why wee are put out, is not FOR RESPECT of our selues, but FOR FEARE of sinning against God*; and (pag. 58) *Except you meane NOT the cause of the Ministers*; and (pag. 150.) *Let the contrarietie of the Answerer, to almost IN his whole Answer written, be observed, &c.* III. By his absurd Paradoxes, which no Diuine euer maintained before him: as (pag. 34.) *The Kingdome of heauen consisteth in the ABUSE of outward things*; also (pag. 36.) *The libertie of Preaching doth NOT PROPERLY belong to the Ministerie of the Gospell*; and, (pag. 120.) *A Minister out of his Ministerie, is NO MINISTER*: there are many more such examples, but I labour to be short.

Secondly, his **MALICE** is apparent in euery page, yea almost in euery line of his *Defence*, wherein hee scorneth, and reproacheth, and slandereth, not only my poore selfe (whom he extreamely hateth for no other cause, but because I am not of his faction) but also all the reuerend Prelates and Magistrates of this Land, yea the whole Church of God amongst vs, as we haue heard already.

When I had first perused ouer this vile and disgracefull Libell, I could but maruel at the impudencie of the Defender, that in so learned an age, durst presume to publish so fillie a worke: Whereupon I purposed to haue passed it ouer with silence, as disdainig to accept so Ignorant a Man for my Antagonist, and to encounter with such, as with an Aduersarie, whom it were fitter to instruct, as a Schoole-boy. But when I had better considered the humor of the refractarie faction, who embrace euery Sentence proceeding from their RABBINES, as an ORACLE, be it neuer so absurd; and perceiued the Booke it selfe, to be preiudiciall to his Maiesties auctoritie and Lawes, to the peace of Gods Church, and propagation of the Gospell, I was perswaded (for this once) to take a litle labour to shew the Defenders folly in his weaker *Defence* of so weak *Arguments*; which I haue done as briefly as I could: for why should I speake much of a Discourse so little worth?

And heere I openly testifie, and plainly professe, both vnto the Defender, and to all others of his straine; that if hereafter any of them shall set vpon, or attempt any thing against any Booke or Writing of mine; if they shall doe it in the common Idiome of the English, I will passe it ouer with silence, and not vouchsafe them any Answer: and this, 1. Because it is not fit and conuenient that this Controuerfie, being moued only amongst Scholers, and no way concerning the Lay-people, should be vulgarly handled, to the increasse of factions and part-takings in the Church. 2. Because that, hauing other employments more necessarie for these times, by this meanes I shall be free from being troubled with the tedious prating, the clamorous and scornfull gybing of euery DVNSE, that can but chatte English.

Wherefore I require and adiure you (my reuerend Brethren) as you tender the quietnes of the Church, yea and your owne honest reputation, that hereafter (if you be not yet satisfied) you will write in the LATINE tongue, which is the tongue of the Learned, and not in the ENGLISH, to fill

THE CONCLUSION. 191

fill the Common-peoples heads with idle and vaine questions: Which reasonable request, if you shall refuse to yeeld vnto, surely it will be thought that all you do, is but *ad faciendum populum*, and also that you are but ignorant and vnlearned men, not able to write in Latine, as indeed all the DISCIPLINARIANS in English are reported to be: I speake not this of all that stand out for the Ceremonies, among whom there are some whom I reuerence for their gifts; but of the giddie *Presbyterians*, such as this simple *Defender* is, who could bee contented these twelue monethes, to suffer my Booke *De Adiaphoribus*, to passe vnanswered, because it was written in Latine, but no sooner came there any thing vnder my name in English, but presently he set vpon it, according vnto the Proverb *Who more bold, then blind Bayard?*

The Lord heale the wounds of his Church, appease this intestine dissention among Brethren, and grant that wee may do all things to the glory of his holy Name.

APOCAL. 7. 12.

Amen. Praise, and Glorie, and Wisdom, and Thanks, and Honor, and Power, and Might, be vnto our GOD for evermore. Amen.

FINIS.